

COPYRIGHT WARNING

Notice: warning concerning copyright restrictions

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

THE
MEANING
AND
DEVELOPMENT
OF
SACRAL
KINGSHIP
IN
THE
OLD
TESTAMENT

By

Richard W. McCandless

1961-1962 Thesis in Lieu of One Full Course
The Episcopal Theological School
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Respectfully submitted,

Richard W. M. Linder

Preface

The writer of this paper would like to take this opportunity for thanking those people who are most responsible for his being able to write it. In the first place, the faculty of the Episcopal Theological School for allowing him to write a senior thesis in place of one full course. A part of this is the permission for this particular investigation, which the faculty granted, although they probably know that the writer had chosen a topic that was too broad for coverage of any truly adequate nature to be made.

The Reverend Jack B. Van Hooser gave help and encouragement in the absence of the advisor, the Reverend Doctor Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr., and some of the suggestions concerning bibliography shortened the search and lightened the labors of the writer considerably.

To the advisor must go the credit for all that is good in this work. In the first instance, he was responsible for the initial interest in the field of Old Testament and then for stirring my interest in the particular topic and encouraging me to begin the investigation. His suggestions about the actual writing, for both content and style, saved the writer many embarrassing mistakes and a good deal of unnecessary labor; but for the final form (and any mistakes or infelicitous phrases) the writer, of course, is fully responsible.

Finally, the writer would like to thank the members of the third floor of Lawrence Hall for their patience in putting up with the author as he complained about all the work he was doing; they showed true Christian charity and they acted truly sympathetic!

R. W. McCandless

Tuesday before Easter, 1962.

Contents

Preface	i
Abbreviations	iv
Chapter I: INTRODUCTION TO SACRAL KINGSHIP	
Introduction	1
Method	5
Approach	8
Chapter II: THE PENTATEUCH	
Introduction	10
The Yahwist	10
The Elohist	13
Deuteronomy	15
The Priestly Code	18
Genesis 11	19
Summary	21
Chapter III: THE FORMER PROPHETS	
Introduction	23
The Court History of David	23
The Pro-monarchical Source	27
The Anti-monarchical Source	33
Nathan's Prophecy	36
The "Last Words" of David	38
The Deuteronomic History	39

Judges 9	40
Judges 8:22ff.	41
The History of the Ark	42
The Books of the Kings	44
Summary	53
Chapter IV: THE PSALMS	
Introduction	55
Psalms 78	56
Psalms 89	57
Psalms 2	60
Psalms 110	63
The Royal Psalms	65
Summary	68
Excursus on the Chronicler	70
Chapter V: CONCLUSION	72
References and Notes	83
Bibliography	95

Abbreviations

ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Alte Testament
ET	Expository Times
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
IB	Interpreter's Bible
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION TO SACRAL KINGSHIP

Introduction

One cannot proceed to any discussion of sacral kingship without first presenting some introduction to the entire problem. This is particularly true in a study such as this since there will be no attempt on the part of the writer to state the positions and conclusions of every scholar who has written in the field; in fact, even the conclusions of those men who are generally acknowledged as having been determinative for the future of the study will not have their theories mentioned at any length. The only way in which this will appear in the succeeding chapters of this paper will be in passing within the context of the investigation. Since this is the case, one must give a brief historical sketch which will present the figures of those who are important to the beginning and the continuation of the study of divine kingship as it is found in the Old Testament. Even here, though, the coverage must necessarily be slight.

In the case of sacral kingship one may begin in a sense with Frazer; "it is almost needless to say that the current interest in the theory of divine kingship and its possible bearing upon the Old Testament springs in some measure from the work of J. G. Frazer . . ." This is true, of course; and there are those who would be considered the heirs of this approach in the discussions of today (particularly the "Myth and Ritual" School and the "Uppsala" School). For the student of the Old Testament, as such, however, we must wait for the work of H. Gunkel, here as in the study of so much of the Old Testament. In his work on the

Psalms he came to the conclusion that the method of approach was to try to classify the psalms according to types and then deal with the question of origin and authorship. As he investigated these forms (Gattungen), he came to the conclusion that the origin of the type lay in the cult though he felt that the majority of the existing psalms had been freed from the cultic framework.

As one of his major types or forms he recognized the psalms concerned with the king and his activities, the "royal psalms." The psalms which he picked for this category are Psalms 2, 18, 20, 21, 45, 72, 101, 110, 132 and 144:1-11 (and also II Samuel 23:1-7). For Gunkel all of these psalms had their Sitz im Leben, their "setting in life," in the life and activities of the king, who was to be considered an Israelite king of the pre-exilic period. "The novelty of Gunkel's treatment does not lie, of course, in his interpretation of the individual psalms, for this was nothing new. It is to be found in the fact that these psalms are now treated, not in comparative isolation, but as a special class which, once it is recognized, enables one to arrive at a more fitting appreciation of the cultic rôle of the king."²

This work on the psalms had a good deal of effect on the later criticism of the psalms, as one might expect.³ There were not too many scholars who were unaffected by Gunkel; but there were those who would use him as the place to begin. One of these was Sigmund Mowinckel in his various studies of the psalms. He had also been affected by the anthropological approach of some of the Scandinavian scholars and this caused him to look around the Near East to gain insight into problems

in which the Old Testament was not explicit enough. He extended the number of "royal" psalms and also denied the contention of Gunkel that the psalms had worked themselves free from the cult. He felt that almost all of the psalms were cultic in intention and origin. The psalms which Mowinckel felt were in the category of "royal" are: Psalms 2, 18, 20, 21, 28, 44, 45, 60, 61, 63, 66, 68, 72, 80, 83, 84, 89, 101, 110, 118, 132 and 144 (and also I Samuel 2:1-10 and II Samuel 23:1-7). As a part of his interest in the cultic use of these psalms, he tried to reconstruct a New Year's Festival which he felt had been held in the Temple in Jerusalem, using parallels from the ancient Near East, notably the Babylonian akitu festival, with some attention being paid to Egyptian models. His use of the psalms for this festival was pretty much restricted to Psalm 132, so far as the content of the feast was concerned.

With this start, many scholars began to work in the field. We shall look briefly at two groups who have been very important in the discussion of the place of the king in the cult and in the ritual. The first of these groups is the so-called "Myth and Ritual" school of England. The main point of the group of scholars which has given rise to this title is that there was a common pattern in the ancient Near East in connection with the god and that the king had a part in the ritual which was centered around the cultic activities of the god. They found bits and pieces of this common ritual pattern everywhere, from Egypt to Mesopotamia; and they felt that there would be a common influence from one area to another. ". . . the most probable influence from the close resemblance between the New Year ritual as it was practiced in Mesopo-

4
tania, Canaan, and Israel, is that all three represent independent developments of a common central ritual. . . .⁴ The form of the New Year festival found in the pattern is, as follows: (a) the dramatic representation of the death and resurrection of the god; (b) the recitation or symbolic representation of the myth of creation; (c) the ritual combat, in which the triumph of the god over his enemies was depicted; (d) the sacred marriage; (e) the triumphal procession, in which the king was playing the part of the god, followed by a train of lesser gods or visiting deities.⁵ It is at this point that we may see the meaning of divine kingship or sacral kingship from the history of the investigations. As the king takes the place of the god in the ritual, his association with the god becomes so close that he takes on some of the divine aspects himself (for one example, Psalm 45:7 may be translated as "thy throne, O God . . ." and the patternists would point to this as evidence of the king's being considered divine; see chapter IV).

Another aspect of patternism is that seen in the "Uppsala" school. There is much dependence here also upon common features to be found in the ancient Near East. In the view of at least one exponent of this collection of Swedish scholars, ". . . the king, who . . . (is) regarded as the embodiment of this dying and rising 'young god,' might also be regarded as an incarnation of the high god."⁶

There is opposition to be found to both of these later schools from many sides, from many different points of view.⁷ One cannot mention all of these objections or the theories of the individuals who hold them. The school which must be mentioned, however, is that of the Germans, A.

Alt and M. Noth. Their general position (with the differences which one would expect between two people) seems to be that the kingship came into being as a political act forced on Israel by the circumstances of the Philistines. Stress is placed on the ark as the center of the religious tradition rather than the king in any cultic activities.⁸ The general similarity between this position and the one which will be outlined in the succeeding chapters of this paper will be noted by the reader. This, then, is the time to acknowledge the debt that the writer feels to these two men and to their influence in other scholars.

From the above description of the various roles which the king is seen as playing in the cult and religion, one can see some of the problems which have been raised. For the purposes of this paper the questions and problems can be stated, as follows: What is the role that the king played in the cult and religion of Israel and what (if any) is the development which can be seen? Does the king have any "sacral" or "divine" status in Israel? To these questions the following pages will attempt an answer.

Method

It is apparent from the historical sketch just completed that the Psalms have provided the impetus and the focus for the discussions and investigations into the question of sacral kingship.⁹ The Psalms were the source, historically, and have continued to be the source of most of the evidence for those who would see a sacral character to the king or to the institution of kingship. This writer believes, however, that the place at which one must begin is the narrative of the Old Testa-

ment. Since we have generally abandoned the attempt to date the psalms by reference to historical events in the past of Israel, we have by that fact made the Psalter essentially timeless. By that is meant that the psalms cannot be used for dating. A psalm may have been written very early, but it may have come into the cult of Israel very late; we cannot tell by the form, the wording, or the content without considerable difficulty. Even if one does have a general idea of the time in which a given psalm became part of the religious literature of Israel, one has only a general idea and cannot base exact discussion on it. For example, being able to date a psalm to the tenth century B. C. is not too helpful if this is all we can do since both David and Solomon fall in this century and there may be a difference between the situation obtaining in each reign. Somehow, we must have an outside control.

The author of this paper believes that the necessary control is to be found in the narrative. In the first place, the historical books can give us the needed information to distinguish between people and reigns and events. Secondly, they can also provide the theology of kingship which we are seeking. This may be more implicit in many of the narratives than it is explicit, but it is there and it is important. Since a narrative will give us some idea of the provenance of the author or compiler, the narrative sources have another advantage over the psalms. We can place the narratives, with the attendant theology, in a particular location (that is, either Israel or Judah) and so have some conception of the difference in point of view between the north and the south with respect to the king. Once there has been the investigation of the theology of kingship and some sort of determination made of the history and

development of the institution of kingship, then one can move on to the psalms and try to show that the same can be seen there, that the psalms fit into the general picture as seen in the other books.

As this investigation proceeds, there can be comparison with the data available from the cultures which may throw light on the origin of some of the concepts or literature which one finds in Israel. On the other hand, the author of this paper feels that it is methodologically unsound to try to read the surrounding culture into the Old Testament. If something is there and this can be demonstrated, it can be very valuable for purposes of exegesis, but to say that because one part of an assumed pattern is in Israel the rest must be must be rejected. In point of actual fact, comparison with the literature and metaphysics of the ancient Near East is done very sparingly in the paper for the reason that the information sought can be found in the Old Testament itself. There must be reference to Canaanite sources, yes, but in this paper reference of this sort has been held to a minimum (though bibliographical references can be found in the bibliography at the end of the paper).

One very fruitful source of information about the religion of Israel, information which can be quite closely dated, is to be found in the prophetic books. We could not use this information, however, for several reasons. In the first place, it is the thesis of this paper that the theology of the institution of kingship had its formative period and its main growth before the canonical prophets began their activity. This means that the information they contain would be valuable for later development but not essential for the establishment of our main points.

Of course, later development can throw light on the situation earlier and the prophetic literature would be very important for this, as well as tracing the later history of the kingship, but not, as we have said, essential.

There is a second, more compelling, reason for this neglect. The relation of the prophet to the cult is at the moment a question of great importance but of great disagreement. Before one could use the information provided by the prophets, one would have to come to some decision about this vexed problem and there was no room for that in the scope of this paper. The author can only hope that this aspect will be taken up in the future and investigated at length (as well it could be) and the results here arrived at modified accordingly.

Approach

The general plan of this paper can be stated quite simply. The next chapter will contain a discussion of the evidence of the kingship which is to be found in the Pentateuch. The material will be treated in a chronological fashion in so far as that is possible or feasible. The third chapter will continue the discussion into the following narrative books, the "Former Prophets" (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings), again with a general chronological plan followed. The next chapter will be the one concerned with the psalms, in which they will be treated within the context which has already been seen. They will cast their light on what has gone before, but they will only be used for supporting evidence, for the reasons cited above. The last chapter will sum up the discussion and try to come to some coherent conclusion which fits the evidence which we have

seen.

And now to our investigation.

Chapter II

THE PENTATEUCH

Introduction

In this chapter the witness to the theology and the practice of kingship in Israel will be investigated through the study of the materials found in those books which stand first in our Bibles, the five books called the Pentateuch. In our discussion the usual source analysis of the Pentateuch into four basic sources or "strata" will be assumed to be correct.¹ These sources will be discussed in the order in which they are usually considered to have been written down; that is: first the J-document or Yahwist, then the E-document or Elohist, thirdly the D-document or Deuteronomy² and finally the P-document or work of the Priestly writers. After this has been completed, there will be a section devoted to Genesis 14, that rather obscure story which stands outside the usual source analysis but which has some relevance to our investigation.

The Yahwist

We shall begin our search for the meaning of sacral kingship in the Old Testament with that stratum of the Pentateuch called the J-document or the Yahwist. It has received this title from the fact that the author (or compiler) has the God of the Israelites known by His Name, Yahweh, from the very beginning of history (Genesis 4:26). The usual date of the document (that is, the approximate date of writing) is considered to be the 10th century B. C.³

It will probably be helpful for us to review some of the charac-

teristics of the Yahwist in order to understand the raison d'être of the document that we may understand why the Yahwist put together the various tales and legends and material of his own to arrive at the connected story which we call the J-document. The document gives the history of the world in the history of Israel down to the settlement of the land of Palestine, at least.⁴ The reason that we consider this a history of the world rather than just a history of the Hebrew people and the action of its God in that history is not just that the source begins with what we would call world history; that is, with the Creation of the world, the Flood, etc. No, the reason that we call this world history is that Yahweh is seen as the God of all history, that His acts concern the entire world, even when they are directed only toward the small nation and people whom He had chosen for Himself at the Exodus. In Yahweh and His actions is seen the meaning of all history for all men, specifically His actions in the history of His people Israel. The course of this history of the world moves from the very beginning of the Creation of the world through the creation of man in this world and the first actions of these people on down through world history as the author saw it with the Flood and then the relations that the patriarchs had with Yahweh and finally to the Exodus, that great salvation-event, and the entrance of the Israelites into Palestine. The promise to Abraham in Genesis 12:1-3 is rather definite about the worldwide aspect of the action of Yahweh. By Abraham "all the families of the earth shall bless themselves" (Genesis 12:3).

This same promise to Abraham is traced by the author down to the time of the occupation of the land. The patriarchs are led by Yahweh from the land in which they begin, the land of their fathers (as it is

told to Abraham), through the various vicissitudes of the later patriarchs down to Joseph, who sets the stage for the time when Israel will become a people. All of the events of the patriarchal period have the hand of Yahweh in them and this continues as we find the Israelites oppressed under a later Pharaoh and then Yahweh raises up Moses to lead His people out of Egypt in the great salvation-event of the Exodus. Yahweh led them after this event into the land of Canaan by Moses and by the physical signs which showed them the way (Genesis 13:21). Finally, they reached the land which was to be theirs, the land which flowed with milk and honey, that land which, in the time of the empire of David and Solomon, was mostly under the control of Israel. We may see in this movement of history which has Yahweh's hand behind it an implicit approval of the empire. He has worked for the settlement of His people in the land which He has chosen for them; and therefore, implicitly, the empire is, if not part of this plan, at least acceptable to it.

The mood of the entire document is so free from bias, so sure that Yahweh has been with Israel in all that has happened, so full of promise for the future, that we can see no anti-royal sentiment. Since the empire may be a part of the plan of Yahweh, so may be the people who are responsible for that empire on the human level, the kings. We see something of an acceptance of the institution of kingship though there is not any "theology" of kingship. The theology has all to do with Yahweh and His actions. This king with his empire may be at the end of the road, but the path leading up to the empire is not to build up the Davidic house. The interest of Yahweh is still the people, not the king. As a

part of the lack of theological interest in the king, there is a lack of the air of a "cultic setting" for the traditions and legends of which J is composed; the completely historical setting in which everything is cast puts any cultic framework far behind the purpose of the author.

We may summarize the evidence found for kingship in the statement that kingship is accepted as part of the situation in which the author finds himself; kingship as such is not contrary to Yahwism as the author of the J-document knows it; but on the other hand, there is no theology of kingship which would lead one to feel that it is important either to the plan of Yahweh for Israel or to the religion which is held by the author and the group to which he belongs (which, as we shall see, has affinities with the southern strain in the literature of Israel).

The Elohist

The second of the documents or strata of the Pentateuch which we shall consider is the E-document or the Elohist. This source has received its name from the habit of the author of using the generic name for God, Elohim, until he has the Name of God, Yahweh, revealed to Moses (Exodus 3:14) in the form which has aroused so much speculation about the derivation of the Name, I AM WHO I AM. This source is usually dated later than the J-document, but there are those who would say that there can be no difference in the age of many of the traditions found there; in fact, that they are from the same oral source originally.⁵

The origin of this document is universally considered to be the north, what later will be called Israel proper or Ephraim. The full significance of this will not be apparent in this chapter but will become

more so as those strata which are related to it can be discussed (see pp. 33ff below). To anticipate somewhat, we shall point out that the anti-monarchical source of the books of Samuel is quite closely related to E (some would say that the anti-monarchical source is a continuation of E, for example) and that some of the basic presuppositions which lie in the background of the Deuteronomist are also present in E. However, for the moment, this quotation will suffice for the further development of this section:

the traditions and history of the people of the north, the descendants of the sons of Israel, were such that it was not possible for monarchy or any institutions through which it might seek to relate itself to religious life to represent or adequately express loyalty to Yahweh.⁶

As one example of what is meant, let us take the figure of Moses. The importance given him is shown by the fact that it is to him that the Divine Name is revealed. Not only is this the case, but he is the only man to speak to Yahweh face to face (Exodus 33:11). If this man is so looked back upon and his deeds have never been surpassed, then no new leader will ever mean so much to the people of Israel. The religion has been given its formation in those acts in the past and innovations cannot be tolerated. Since this is the situation, it is obvious that a new institution such as that of kingship will not be looked upon with great favor. As in most conservative, backward-looking ideologies, the new is suspect and something to be resisted.

Another indication of the anti-kingship bias may be seen in the frequent reference to "prophets." For example, Genesis 20:7, ". . . for he is a prophet . . ." or Exodus 15:20, "Miriam, the prophetess, the

sister of Aaron . . ." and, above all, the reference in Deuteronomy 34:10, "And there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face . . ." ⁷ While we again see the stress on Moses and his part in the religion of Israel, we also see a stress on the importance of the prophets and their place in Yahwism. This may not be anti-monarchical bias, but given the later fact of the prophetic revolution in the north, this implication is there.

More than what has been said will have to be left until our investigation of those strata which are allied to E, the anti-monarchical source of Samuel especially. We shall see more of the reason for the anti-monarchical bias which is to be seen here as we investigate further in the history of the north and in the documents which are related to E (which we mentioned above).

Deuteronomy

The third of the major sources of the Pentateuch is that contained in the book of Deuteronomy. ⁸ The usual critical "orthodoxy" with respect to this book is that it has some connection with the book which is supposed to have been found in the Temple and which formed the basis of the so-called Josianic reform (II Kings 22:10). With all the discussion and attempts to date the book either earlier or later, the basic place which it holds with respect to the other sources of the Pentateuch remains secure, ⁹ coming after J and E and before P. Another notable fact is that the date of the actual, written copy of this work does not mean that everything in it dates from the actual writing; some of it may well be much earlier. ¹⁰ An important point for our purposes is that the provenance

of this document is now considered by many to be the north, Israel or Ephraim,¹¹ which may mean that we shall see some of the same picture which we saw above in E.

This is just the case. There is an even stronger emphasis on Moses and his activities and what he represents in terms of the religion of Israel. An example of this is the fact that the book itself is set in sermons which Moses delivered to the people of Israel: "These are the words which Moses spoke to all Israel beyond the Jordan . . ." (Deuteronomy 1:1). The rapt and complete attention to what happened to Israel when Moses was the leader shows us an intensification of the feeling which one had while looking at the E-document. The attention paid to the ancient traditions was so complete and they are considered to be so definitive that no later institution can have much importance, certainly no purely human institution such as the kingship.

Even Moses pales beside the importance which Yahweh has here. Of course, Yahweh is the important Figure in the Old Testament wherever one chooses to look, but Deuteronomy gives explicit formation to the statement that Israel must devote itself to Yahweh, Who has done everything for it, His chosen people. If the people hearken to the commandments which Yahweh gives them, they will do well; if they do not follow those commandments, it will go ill with them (see especially Deuteronomy 4). These laws which go back to the time of Moses, according to Deuteronomy, are normative for Israel; they define what Israel is and what she should be.

One might expect that under such a theological basis any later

institution—that of kingship, for example—would get little notice and have little importance. This is the case. In all the laws and commandments which one finds in this book there is only one passage in which the king is mentioned.¹² It is worth glancing at it a bit more carefully:

When you come to the land which the Lord your God gives you, and you possess it and dwell in it, and then say, "I will set a king over me, like all the nations that are round about me," you may indeed set as king over you him whom the Lord your God will choose. One from your brethren you shall set as king over you . . . Only he must not multiply horses for himself, or cause the people to return to Egypt in order to multiply horses . . . And when he sits on the throne of his kingdom, he shall write for himself in a book a copy of this law (Deuteronomy 17:14-18).

This excerpt is interesting to us for two main reasons. The reference to all the nations gives the impression that (to the author or authors of Deuteronomy) the institution of kingship is not something which is native to Israel; it is something which has been picked up and which the author(s) wish had been left to the nations! The king is not essential to the life of Israel and the king did not come to being in Israel when she really was Israel, back in the time of Moses when Yahweh gave His revelation to His people. But if there must be a king, he must be chosen by Yahweh. Yahweh is the important figure, not the king.

There is a second thing to be noted about this brief passage (other than its very brevity, which shows something about the importance of the kingship); this is the reference to the horses. We have here a reference to Solomon and his habits (at the very earliest).¹³ Whatever

the precise reason that the author(s) placed this restriction in the law, it has meaning for us in that there is a hint of dissatisfaction with the way kings acted in the time of Solomon or later. There is no mention of the practices of David. The importance of a mere phrase is open to question, but it is something to be remembered for the future.

The Priestly Code

The fourth stratum of the Pentateuch is that given us by the priestly writers of the Exile, the Priestly Code or P. Its written form dates from sometime after the Exile, but modern scholars would say that there is much ancient material contained in it.¹⁴

Whatever the reason lying behind the document,¹⁵ there is here a deliberate attempt to return to the Mosaic period (with the added accoutrements of the Temple cult) in a manner which says that everything which happened in history after Moses is not important. Moses is given the center of the stage, but it is not a very human center; he is used as a mouthpiece of Yahweh only. Some of the best examples of this are to be found in the middle of the book of Exodus. For example, in Exodus 21:22, Yahweh says that Moses shall say the following to the people of Israel and then He goes on without a break until chapter 24, at which time there are a few verses of narrative and then more instruction to Moses until the end of chapter 31. The deeds of men have very little place here, and this would include the king.

Not only is this true, but it seems that the author(s) of P would consider any religious development after Moses, or at least what they think is the time of Moses, apostasy. The law is important, the

fact that there will be kings is acknowledged (Genesis 17:6ff.); but the reference to the land only seems to give Israel a place where she can worship Yahweh in the way He has commanded. What little we find of the king is probably to be considered in some such light also. After the Exile, when there were no kings and the priests had taken over the ritual functions the kings had had (see chapter III), it would be known that the king could not be the center of the life of the people and their worship of Yahweh. This is obvious since there is no king and the worship of Yahweh must go on. With this the case, the empire and the king who was a part of it are looked at as being only incidental to the religion of Israel. This had been a stage in history, but not in the history of the covenants which Yahweh had made with His people. Therefore, the author(s) can dismiss the king with a few relatively unimportant words.

More than this cannot be said. The theological perspective which turns people into "drab and lifeless"¹⁶ caricatures of real people, utterly unlike the people J presents (or, looking ahead, the Court History of David), must also so affect the historical perspective that little more can be said about any help from P in our search for information about the institution of kingship in Israel.

Genesis 14

This chapter is not to be considered as one of the major sources of the Pentateuch, but it is not one of the four strata which we have seen before.¹⁷ Our interest lies in the very obscure story about Abram and Melchisedek of Jerusalem, in which Melchisedek, the priest-king, comes out and blesses Abram in the name of El 'Elyon (the God Most High

of the RSV). Abram tithes to Melchisedek (Genesis 14:18-20).

Our discussion may begin with the fact that these three verses may easily be detached from the framework of the rest of the chapter; the result when this is done gives far better continuity to what remains. Since we wish to concentrate on this passage, the remainder of the chapter need not concern us.

Part of the difficulty which we face may be shown by the fact that one can easily pick up two scholars with exactly opposing views about the pericope. For example, F. M. Cross would say that the story has old roots with Psalm 110 giving confirmation;¹⁸ on the other hand, K-H Bernhardt gives just the opposite interpretation, saying that Psalm 110 is late.¹⁹

Our interpretation would be something like this: this particular pericope is a late insertion trying to give a connection between the patriarch and the cult of Jerusalem, some time after the cult at Jerusalem became important. There is certainly enough evidence showing a connection between El 'Elyon and Jerusalem (see, for example, Psalms 9, 21, 46, 50 and 87, psalms which probably refer to Jerusalem and its cult). There is also the connection with Melchisedek which can be seen in Psalm 110. In fact, Psalm 110 or some tradition like it might be the basis for this story in the time of the Davidic monarchy after the fall of Jerusalem to David, probably in the reign of Solomon or later, since it is at this time that the Jerusalem cult made its greatest inroads in the religion of Israel (see p. 46).

More than this one cannot say; the ambiguousness of the story precludes any great edifice being built on it. This may be used as evi-

dence to support an already existing thesis; it cannot establish one of its own.

Summary

To give a brief summary of the very divergent evidence which has been adduced so far, we begin with the first document considered, J. In J was found no real importance attached to the king and no real theology of kingship, but the institution is accepted as a part of the history which Yahweh has worked, so there is a limited approval found implicitly.

With E a much different situation was found. For the author of E Moses and the "old-time religion" was important and made Israel what she should be. In this theology any part of the king is too much to have a place in the religious life of Israel. We can expect no theology of kingship to live in an atmosphere like this.

For the authors of Deuteronomy kingship is not essential to Israel, especially as a religious factor and the king must live under the law given like anyone else. The only real prohibition which was found was applicable to the time of Solomon or later, not to the time of David.

The Priestly Code practically ignores the king as a factor in the religious life of Israel, which is understandable, since the king was not a factor at the time of the writing (in fact, there had to be some way to go without a king; he could not be important). Certainly, the theological perspective of P is such that we should not expect to find a theological justification for kingship within the document, even implicitly.

The last bit of evidence which could be found was that ambiguous piece in Genesis 14, evidence which could say almost nothing. The balance

of probability is that it came from the time of Solomon or later, attempting to show early contact and connection between the patriarch Abram and the cult and priest-king of Jerusalem. More than this this pericope will not bear.

Chapter III

THE FORMER PROPHETS

Introduction

In the last chapter we looked at the evidence for kingship—and the feeling for it which existed—in the various strata contained in the first five books of the Bible, the Pentateuch. In this chapter we shall continue our investigation into the section of the Bible which follows directly after the Pentateuch, the section called by the Jewish people the Former Prophets. This section contains the following books: Joshua, Judges, Samuel (since this is considered to be one book in the Jewish Bible and by scholars instead of the two we have in the English Bible) and Kings (the situation here being the same as with Samuel). These historical books will provide us with the majority of the information which we shall need for our conclusions about the institution of kingship in Israel.

The division of this chapter will be, as follows (again trying to continue a system roughly chronological as to date of writing): the Court History of David, the Pro-monarchical Source of Samuel, the Anti-monarchical Source of Samuel, the Deuteronomic History and several isolated passages not placed chronologically but covered at the end of the chapter for convenience' sake.

The Court History of David

This connected narrative, found in II Samuel 9 - 20 and I Kings 1 - 2, is usually considered to be the oldest piece of continuous narrative in the entire Old Testament and to be dated in the period which it

covers—the majority of the reign of David and the entrance of Solomon as king in his father's stead.

We have the work of a contemporary author, not the accumulation of popular tradition given shape and coherence by a later hand. This is clear from the scope and sequence of the narrative, and from the first-hand knowledge of events and persons at David's court which the document reflects.¹

With this firsthand knowledge comes a freedom to use the knowledge to give a history, almost a biography, of David in an impartial, non-judgmental way which gives a picture of the man in a sense which we see in no other literary document of this time or before.

We see this most clearly in the well-known story of David and Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, in II Samuel 11. The exact account of what happened is related without any moralism being shown, without any editorial comments being made. David is shown as being the man he was, lusting after another man's wife and doing something about it with the power he had. It is not really moralizing that the next chapter shows the prophet Nathan telling David that he has done evil in the sight of Yahweh; there is probably some Deuteronomic phrasing in this, but the kernel is certainly true.

This little story shows not only the freedom with which the person of David is handled by the author of the Court History; it also shows how little sacredness there is about the person of the king in the eyes of this author. David has done wrong; he has been rebuked, as anyone would be; and, in this case, he is punished. That is all; there is no hint that he, as king, could do whatever he wanted to do. No, there is still law in Israel: it is Yahweh's law and it is the important factor in

the moral life.

From this example of the ethos of this section of the Former Prophets, we must look at some of the facts which are preserved for us by this writer, facts which are more relevant directly for the subject under discussion. We may begin by noting that in the very chapter we have ended our discussion with, in verse 7, we see the comment that David has been given the house of Israel and the house of Judah as if there were some difference between them. This straw in the wind will be looked at in more detail, now.

This difference may be seen most clearly in the section following Absalom's revolt—chapters 19ff. of II Samuel. After Absalom has been defeated with his men and the men who had survived had gone to their homes, David calls to the house of Judah for some reason (II Samuel 19:12). They are his kinsmen and he calls them to return to him, which they do (II Samuel 19:14f.). The result of this is to be seen in vv. 41ff. The ten tribes of Israel are very much provoked at all this (in addition, there is the matter of Amasa and Joab), particularly since they feel that their ten tribes should count more than Judah's two (v. 43). The final result may be seen in the abortive revolt of Israel under Sheba, the Benjaminite (the tribe of Saul—see below) in chapter 20. Israel has "no portion in David . . . no inheritance in the son of Jesse . . ." (II Samuel 20:1). This continues in v. 2, "so all the men of Israel withdrew from David, and followed Sheba the son of Bichri; but the men of Judah followed their king steadfastly . . ." The rebellion is put down and Israel returns, but here is strong evidence of some sort

of difference between the south and the north.

A point which will be of great importance in the future begins to be seen here rather explicitly. In II Samuel 20:23ff. we see some of the leaders of David's reign. Joab, the old Israelite, who has been a strong supporter of David all along, is commanding the army of Israel (Israel here apparently meaning the totality of Israel, "Israel" and Judah) and Benaiah the son of Jehoiada is commanding the Cherethites and the Pelethites, the hired mercenaries who do not belong to the old type of Israelite army (as we shall see later).

When we look ahead to I Kings 1:5-8 (which is the continuation of the Court History), we see the very curious circumstance of one of the sons of David deciding that he will be king and gaining support from some of the men around the king.² The point to note is that the support which he gains is from those who were the old Israelites, who had been with David from the beginning: Joab and Abiathar the priest and descendant of Eli (I Kings 2:27). It is significant that Zadok (who may be non-Israelite since he does not appear before the conquest of Jerusalem; the name is also similar to Melchizedek of Genesis 14 and Adonizedek of Joshua 1) and Benaiah (the non-Israelite who commands the mercenary forces) and Nathan the prophet do not go with him and, in fact, they support his rival, Solomon.

Solomon is anointed king by the priest Zadok³ and immediately proceeds to "get rid" of his rival and those who had supported him. Both Adonijah and Joab are killed at the command of Solomon by Benaiah. The priest Abiathar, who has been with David since his pre-regnal days

(see I Samuel 22:20), is sent away and Zadok takes over as the only priest. (Before, when one was mentioned, the other usually was, too. See II Samuel 15:24, 29, 35; 19:11; 20:25, for examples). It will be very apparent later that this all means that the old Yahwistic element in the kingdom has been displaced in favor of the newer elements more "in tune" with the ethos of the Near East, of which Israel is now an important element.⁴

To recapitulate some points briefly, we have seen no real trace of any special feeling for kingship, especially theologically. There is feeling for David, yes, but the flavor is much like that seen in the Yahwist epic (see page 12 above). The importance of the historical points will be apparent as more of the factors surrounding the reigns of David and Solomon are brought out in the succeeding sections of this chapter.

The Pro-Monarchical Source

There are other names for this particular source of the books of Samuel, one of which is the "early" source.⁵ That this title is not used here is not due so much to a doubt that this is an "early" source as to a wish to use a title more in keeping with our investigation.⁶ The contents of this source or stratum within Samuel will basically be considered to be that given by G. W. Anderson in his Critical Introduction to the Old Testament,⁷ which is based on that of A. R. S. Kennedy. This is not the only outline which could have been used, but it does seem to represent critical opinion sufficiently well to form the basis of our investigation. The exact passages which are thought to be part of this source are, as follows: I Samuel 9-10:16; 11:1-11, 15; 13-14; 16:14-17:11;

17:32-40, 42-49, 51-54; 18:6-23:13; 25-II Samuel 6. Any deviation from this will be noted in the proper place.

The date of this material has been estimated to be in the 10th century B. C., which places it very close to the events which it is describing (although this does not guarantee accuracy any more than a late date of writing guarantees inaccuracy). In general, however, this source does give the impression of reliability and accuracy as to events, with not too much editorial comment; there is the inevitable fact that the very selection of events recorded is itself an attempt at an explanation of the meaning of the events. This was important in our investigation of the Court History; it will be even more important as this chapter progresses.

The reason for the title of the stratum or source being the "Promonarchical" is to be found in the way in which it handles the event of kingship as it appears on the scene of Israel's history and the meaning which it gives to that event of kingship. To see this, we may begin with Saul: in I Samuel 9:16 is said (in Yahweh's revelation to Samuel the prophet):

Tomorrow about this time I will send to you a man from the land of Benjamin, and you shall anoint him to be prince (naghidh)⁸ over my people Israel. He shall save my people from the hand of the Philistines; for I have seen the affliction of my people, because their cry has come to me.

We may note the fact that Saul is chosen (and anointed) to save Israel from the Philistines. This choosing of someone to save Israel has roots in the past as we shall see in the section dealing with the Deuteronomic

History. This provides the historic framework and raison d'être for the coming of Saul to power. That this is probably the real reason as well as the reason given may be seen by his works; he does go out to fight the Philistines and has some success at the beginning (see I Samuel 13:2-4).

However, there is something which is more important for us implicit in this story: Saul has been chosen by Yahweh for the salvation of Israel. This makes Saul a part of the plan of Yahweh and if this same thing is true of David, the fact of kingship is part of the plan of Yahweh also. We shall see later.

Granted that the real hero of this story is David, we see enough of Saul to see that the rejection which comes to him is as rejection of him and not of the office which he held. David was a better soldier than Saul and had more success against the Philistines (I Samuel 18:5ff.), but Saul was the king until he died and no one could harm Yahweh's anointed or take his place until he died (I Samuel 26:11, 23). Even though the reason Saul had been chosen is what we would call "secular," the notice taken of it is "religious"—Saul is chosen of Yahweh and inviolate because of it.

We may note that Saul used the men of Israel in the old fashion (I Samuel 13:2; also, see below). David, on the other hand, was a mercenary leader himself for the Philistines after he left Saul (I Samuel 29:3) and had a standing army with him all the time he was hiding from Saul. Presumably, he learned these "modern" methods from the Philistines very well, for, as we have seen, he kept these mercenaries with him all his life and used them well. For one example, he used his own men when

he conquered the Jebusite city of Jerusalem (II Samuel 5:6) and not the armies of Israel. We saw some of the results of this policy earlier when discussing the Court History; now, the important thing to notice is that this represents a change from the old way of doing things that Israel had known from her earliest days in Palestine.

As we have seen, David did not try to take over Israel until the death of Saul.⁹ A further fact to be noted is that he was anointed king over the tribes of the south, Judah (II Samuel 2:4) in Hebron; he did not become king over the northern tribes, Israel, at once. What did happen is that the son of Saul, Ishbaal,¹⁰ was made king over the northern tribes by Abner, the commander of Saul's army (II Samuel 2:8). The account we have gives no hint of anointing or special ceremony, etc., as will be done to David (see below), but it is at least possible and, given the usual Israelite practice, it may be probable, that Ishbaal was also anointed king over Israel and that this is the reason why David did not take over completely before his death. We do know that David gained more and more ground (II Samuel 3:1); it does seem likely that he could have taken over militarily if he had wished. Could the reason that he held off be the one which caused him to hold his hand from Saul?

We must also note that David is chosen by his friends, the elders of Judah (I Samuel 30:26), to be king over Judah; he is anointed and reigns in Hebron for seven years and six months (II Samuel 2:11). After the death of Ishbaal the tribes of the north, Israel, come to him and ask him to be king over them (II Samuel 5:1-4). He accedes to their request, makes a covenant with them and is anointed king. This covenant idea

which is found here is something peculiar to the northern tribes,¹¹ not found in the south with the same strength or with the same tradition, and gives a flavor of the kingship being on a different footing in the north. Also, the very fact that each of the two groups we have found in the whole of Israel (Judah and Israel) chose its own king strengthens our suspicions that the institution of kingship may be looked at a little differently by each; we have now a little more evidence to add to the hints we have seen before, yet there is still more coming.

According to our source the next thing that happens is that David (and his men, not the gathered tribes of Israel) take the old Jebusite city of Jerusalem. Not too much of this is made in the text, but this is to have a good deal of importance in the future for Israel and its religion. This, in fact, is a momentous occasion for Israel and the future. When David takes this city, he probably thinks that he is doing possibly two things: he is ridding himself of a city that could obstruct his communications between one part of his empire and the other since it was in the middle. Secondly, he may have wanted to take this city for the additional political reason that it was a neutral city. The city which had been his capital when he was only king over Judah was Hebron, but Hebron was a city which had important connections with Judah and the southern traditions (see, for example, Genesis 13:1ff. (J) and Pfeiffer, p. 155f.). If he had stayed in Hebron, he might have found that Israel was displeased; if he had moved to a city of the north (Shechem, for example) he would certainly have displeased the south and that was the center of his strength. This was a good solution; he could take Jerusalem

with his own men (thereby giving neither Judah nor Israel a claim) and make it a neutral capital. And this is just what he did. This had a further consequence; with Jerusalem he took over the traditions of the city concerning the king. The difficulty lies in the fact that no one really knows just what these traditions are; in fact, there are those who would say that there was no tradition of kingship in Jerusalem, that the city was ruled by an oligarchy.¹² This is not the place to discuss the subject further; this will be done in more detail below.

The second item connected with Jerusalem which we shall note at this time is the story of II Samuel 6 about the establishment of the ark in Jerusalem. There are many aspects to this problem also, but one can see on the face of it that this would have the effect of connecting the old Yahwistic religion with Jerusalem. The cult center, the ark, was now in Jerusalem; Jerusalem had become the city where Yahweh was pleased to dwell. "Jerusalem ist jetzt Zentralheiligtum des Zwölfstämmeverbandes!"¹³ It is the ark—not kingship—which is to make Jerusalem so holy to Yahweh in Israelite tradition.¹⁴ These latter developments we do not see yet, but they are implicit in the very fact of the ark's being brought to Jerusalem. David has done much more than he knows or will ever know by this act! The importance for our purposes, however, is somewhat limited, mostly to the development of the theme that the ark, not the kingship, is the important thing in Jerusalem; and that theme cannot be developed quite yet. Another point to be noted is that David acts like a priest in this story, wearing the ephod, sacrificing, and blessing the people (II Samuel 6:14ff.). David is acting the priest-king at this point—

he is doing more too, he is dancing before the ark, but the point of that is somewhat obscure unless it is the type of ecstatic dance that the prophets performed (in which case, Michal would have a right to be angry; this is beneath the dignity of a king, at least the sort of king one saw in the Near East—but see below in the next section of the paper.)¹⁵

The important thing to remember about this source (so far as its ethos is concerned) is that there is very little bias against the institution of kingship though there is bias for one particular king.¹⁶ We have also seen some change between the situation of David and Saul in the matter of the type of leadership which each afforded for Israel—Saul leading the host of Israel and David having a standing army. The effect, if any, of the move to Jerusalem has not been apparent except that we have seen David acting like his own priest at the time he brought the ark into Jerusalem. These motifs will again come to the surface of our discussion at a later point.

The Anti-monarchical Source

This part of the books of Samuel has also been given the name of the "late" source because of the language used and because of some of the more magical features which it contains (e. g., the Philistines being driven back by Yahweh's thundering (a storm?)). This may well be true, but one may note that the time of writing does not necessarily prejudice the seeds of the material; that is, the roots of the stories may be true even if they have been much worked over by editors. In any case, our interest is not only with the absolute dating or even the rela-

tive dating, but with the attitudes and facts (so far as these can be discovered) concerning the monarchy and the institution of kingship; for this purpose, as was the case with the pro-monarchical source, the title anti-monarchical source will be quite sufficient (though we may note some similarities with the E-document).

As before, the basis for the discussion will be those passages given by G. W. Anderson as belonging to this source.¹⁷ He lists the following chapters and verses: I Samuel 2:27-36; 7:2-8:22; 10:17-24; 12; and II Samuel 7. While there is some doubt about some of these, the only case which needs special mention at this time is II Samuel 7. As Anderson himself says, "what is a prophecy of the permanence of the Davidic dynasty doing in a source which is critical of the monarchy?"¹⁸ For this reason, if for no others, II Samuel 7 will not be covered as a part of the anti-monarchical source but will be given a separate section of its own since it seems to stand outside the sources as usually given.

The first clue which one really has as to the feeling of the author(s) of this stratum within the books of Samuel for the king could well be the manner in which the work and importance of Samuel himself is stressed. For example, in I Samuel 7:13 it is said that "the hand of the Lord was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel." It is due to Samuel that there is success in war against the Philistines; the distinct impression which one has is that the king matters not at all—only Samuel.

This impression is heightened as one takes a look at the more explicit references to the king and the institution of kingship. In I

Samuel 8:7 we read: "And the Lord said to Samuel, 'Hearken to the voice of the people in all that they say to you; for they have not rejected you, but they have rejected me from being king over them.'" This continues on to give Samuel authority to make a king for them—Samuel is given the authority to make the king for all Israel. Yes, Israel wants a king like all the nations. When this is added to the comment in I Samuel 12:14 ("If you will fear the Lord and serve him and hearken to his voice and not rebel against the commandment of the Lord, and if both you and the king who reigns over you will follow the Lord your God, it will be well"), we see something which is very similar to the strictures found in Deuteronomy 17:14ff. The language is very similar too; the theology is very similar (this will become even clearer when the work and theology of the Deuteronomistic historians are discussed); and the cautions against kings are similar though not exactly the same. Certainly, this passage must date after Saul and probably dates after Solomon; in any case, this is all dead set against the king. For Israel to take a king like all the nations is for her to leave her true king, Yahweh. This is why the source is called anti-monarchical.

The only further comment to make is that the theology which this source displays seems to be much more at home in the north than in the south; its linguistic and theological roots are much more similar to E and Deuteronomy (of the sources we have examined) than to J, for example. We have not yet adduced the evidence to show that this is the case, but this will appear before too long. Accepting for the moment that the anti-monarchical source does spring from the north, can we see why the northern

tribes were always so ready to go on their way without Judah and without the king? Or can we see, conversely, how that fact that the north was ready to go it alone without Judah or the Davidic king could find expression in a theology such as this?

As further evidence, one may cite the fact that Samuel is called a judge; in fact, he is said to have judged Israel all the days of his life (I Samuel 7:14). While he may have been a judge,¹⁹ at least there seems to be some looking to the past here. What Israel really is belongs to what she has been, we want none of this new-fangled king business. This backward-looking emphasis to what Israel has been is just more evidence to show what we have already seen—an anti-monarchical, pro-northern theology. This will become clearer as more of the strata of the historical books are given examination.

Nathan's Prophecy

In II Samuel 7 the prophet Nathan comes up to David and delivers what purports to be a prophetic oracle concerning David and his house. In the first place, he is not to build a house for Yahweh to dwell in; in the second place, the Davidic "house" will be established and Yahweh will be like a father to the king. Early opinion concerning this chapter was pretty much unanimous with most commentators saying that this was quite late;²⁰ now, scholars are not so sure about this. Some, if not most, would say that there are at least very ancient roots to the prophecy.²¹

In the first place, there are two parts to the prophecy, II Samuel 7:1-7 and 7:8-17. Dr. Cross (in the unpublished class-notes mentioned

above) stated that the first part probably went back to a Davidic prophecy in almost those words, something with which the majority would agree, I believe. In any case, as Dr. Cross pointed out, if David had started to build a temple, he was dissuaded by the prophet; he turned aside from his plan. While this may tell us something negatively about David, it tells us very little positively about just what happened; since there were no other effects, we may ignore this.

The second part of the oracle is the place in which the real bone of contention lies. Just how much of the oracle is genuine, just what the age is; both of these are important questions and ones which are difficult to answer. That there is some connection with the psalms is almost certain,²² but just what this connection is is a point of disagreement among many people. Without giving everyone's exact position, this much may be said: the roots of this part of the oracle probably go back to monarchical times. This writer would place the basis of the oracle in the time of Solomon (if it can be done so exactly) because of the content of the passage (even if, with Caird,²³ one discards v. 13 as a later interpolation). The reason for this will be apparent in the following sections, but this much may be pointed out now. Much of the placement of this oracle depends on the time at which the psalms became part of the cult of Israel (see below); there is also the matter of the Temple, which David did not build and Solomon did. With all the change which one can discern in the Davidic kingship one can still see much that remains of good Yahwism. If this oracle is connected with the psalms in the Temple cult (two suppositions yet to be established), then

it would connect much better with the time of Solomon than it would with David. Cross would add that following piece of evidence to that: if this were Davidic, there would be mention of a covenant here, and there is none; therefore, it is from Solomonic times or later.²⁴

The "Last Words" of David

There is some doubt about this little poem, as to whether or not it was written by David. The problem is well stated by the footnote given in the RSV to v. 1 of this section (II Samuel 23:1-7). The translation is: "the sweet psalmist of Israel"; the footnote is: "the favorite of the songs of Israel." In the one case, it may be written by David; in the latter, probably not, since David might not write that way about himself. Assuming that this passage does go back to David or his time (which would be equally useful for our purposes), there is the additional problem of the text. Caird says that "the text is appallingly corrupt"²⁵ and Cross would agree, saying that nothing can be read after the "covenant" in v. 5 is mentioned.²⁶ That such is the case may be seen by the number of emendations given in Driver's Notes²⁷ for the last few verses.

The textual corruption, which could be a witness to the antiquity of the poem, means that it is rather difficult to understand and to use for any theory or theology of kingship in Israel. Some theory of a "covenant" with the Davidic house and Yahweh can be gained, but little more; we cannot even see much of what any possible terms of the covenant would be, just that there was one. Any further explication must come from other sources.

This much could be said at this point, however; the idea of a

covenant with Yahweh is not something new with Israel. Yahweh had made a covenant with His people way back in the traditions of the beginnings with Moses. He also had made the covenant with Abraham; so this idea was in Israel's religious tradition and could be used if necessary. It could have been used by David, but supportive evidence will have to be seen for any definite statement.

The Deuteronomic History

The material contained in the books we call the Former Prophets has been selected by an editor or editors and put together in the form we have it. How do we know this and what is the significance of the title given, the Deuteronomic History?

On the one hand, all kinds of older historical material have been gathered together and combined into a thematic unity by means of a comprehensive framework. On the other, the choice of material is obviously restricted, and for all that lies beyond the theology of history which is to be demonstrated, the reader is continually directed to the sources.²⁸

"These books have all passed through the hands of writers who shared the ideals and wrote in the characteristic style of the original Deuteronomy."²⁹ These quotations give us our orientation and introduction to the source (actually, the compiler in this case) which we are beginning to consider now and with which we shall conclude our consideration of the historical books. The evidence on which the decisions of these scholars are based will appear at times as we continue our discussion; so no examples will be given at this time. We must, however, look at the theology which the Deuteronomist³⁰ has taken from the book of Deuteronomy and which

he uses as the basis for the selection he has presented us with.

From the time of the Conquest to the fall of Jerusalem, obedience to Yahweh's commands is the test; and it is disobedience and apostasy that finally lead to disaster. There is a repeated emphasis on the fulfilment of prophecy, as if to demonstrate that the supreme power which kings and people encounter in history is the power of Yahweh's word. Disaster is not misfortune; it is judgement.³¹

Since there is obviously entirely too much material left uncovered in the Former Prophets, some principle of selection will have to be made (with less obvious omissions than the Deuteronomist, one hopes!), from the sources available. The general plan will be, as follows: the important pericopes (for our purpose) in Joshua and Judges will be considered; e. g., the story of Abimelech in Judges; then the majority of this section will be devoted to an investigation of the history which we have not already seen connected with Solomon; and finally, there will be a brief investigation of the history of the institution of kingship down to the end of the books of Kings in the 6th century B. C.

Judges 9. The story of Abimelech and his rule over Shechem is rather interesting from our perspective since it does, by its very selection, show us an attitude toward kingship even though the tale itself is mostly concerned with non-Israelites. As it stands, it tells about the just retribution which came upon Abimelech and the men of Shechem for their "wickedness" and "crimes." The use of the fable of Jotham not only gives an example of the effectiveness of the prophetic word and of the justice of Yahweh, it also gives just a hint of anti-monarchical feeling. The men of Shechem reject the leadership of the elders and choose a king

(according to the fable, the person least able to do anything), all the while acting against true justice and so storing up the seeds of their own destruction. It may be reading too much into this story, but there may be a little feeling that a king is a bad thing, not just Abimelech the man. In the way we might state it, "when you choose a king, you will choose the person least able to rule; so do not choose a king."

This is too light a hint to be used for much; but since this sort of interpretation will fit in well with the theology of the Deuteronomist, it could be another "straw in the wind" which we can use as part of the theology against the king which we see in some parts of the Old Testament.

Judges 8:22ff. These few verses about the offer to rule (not reign; the word here is mashal, to rule, not malak, to reign, from which comes the word melek, king) to Gideon, while they may be editorial (they remind us of the anti-monarchical source, see above), may also show pre-monarchical dislike of one-man rule that is hereditary. This, too, is consistent with the position of the judges in Israel. They are raised up by Yahweh for the purpose of saving His people, but the rule of the judge seems to be only for the judge's lifetime (see Judges 2:16ff.).³² The rejection, if not the wording, is the important point to note; here is the thought that Yahweh raises up a man and not a house, a thought which seems to fit well with the pre-monarchical situation. From this we may be able to see the reason for some of the opposition to the kingship as an institution which has been seen in the literature which we have investigated. Those who held a backward-looking theology would look back to see what Israel had been like in the days when she had really

been Israel and see that she had not had a king, particularly one who had not been raised up by Yahweh in an emergency.³³

The History of the Ark (I Samuel 4-7:1 & II Samuel 7 (?)).

Again, the terminology here is taken from G. W. Anderson's Introduction, as he followed Kennedy.³⁴ The inclusion of II Samuel 7 here is due to Anderson rather than Kennedy, who placed it in the anti-monarchical source. There is a strong possibility of its belonging here because of the reference (?) found in II Samuel 7:4-7; but since we have already discussed that chapter, we shall not return to it.

The importance of this section of the Deuteronomistic History for our purposes lies in its negative witness no less than its positive witness. First, on the positive side, we can see the importance given to the ark and the reliance placed on it at an early time.³⁵ Since it had such extremely religious importance for the Israelites, we can see the importance of the step which David took when he brought the ark to Jerusalem (some of which we saw in the discussion of the pro-monarchical source; see above, p.32). As we did before, we must again place stress on the religious insight of David in bringing the center of religious life of the people to Jerusalem; this was a move of incalculable importance. The seeds of the reason for that importance lie here in these few chapters.

The negative importance which we might see here lies in the little emphasis given to any human leader other than the priests who served the ark. One might expect that the major emphasis would be on the ark rather than on any human leader of the fight; but there is not only lit-

the importance placed on the human leader, there is no human leader shown—the ark leads them, the host of Israel, into battle—Yahweh is doing everything. While we may not be able to read too much into this concerning any necessity for kingship, since this pericope is focused on the religious atmosphere rather than on any possible political necessity for a king (which did come), we can still see some evidence here for a view that the human leader is not necessary, Yahweh will do the leading; this point of view could lead at a later time to a rejection of kingship as an institution even though the author may not have thought of this explicitly.

Before we proceed to the concluding section of this chapter, there must be little review made of what we mentioned earlier about the type of kingship that we saw under Saul. We said that Saul probably became king under that old type of charismatic leadership or kingship of the judges and we pointed to I Samuel 9:16 as an example of this. Saul was chosen to save his and Yahweh's people from the Philistines. As a part of this same pro-monarchical source, there is the somewhat obscure story in I Samuel 11:5ff. in which Saul cuts the ox into twelve pieces to call the tribes together when he hears about the sad straits of the people in Jabesh. The very obscurity of the story may well mean that the roots behind it are true and representative of the type of thing which would call the tribes together. There is a great deal of similarity here to the charismatic raising of the judges to save Israel, in so far as we can really see through the Deuteronomic editing. One scholar would go so far as to say that "Saul was a leader of the same kind as

Gideon and Jephthah."³⁶ In fact, he would say more; he would go to the point of saying that "Saul was entirely in the old style."³⁷ This writer would point to the evidence that would show that there was some tendency on the part of Saul to be a bit more than the old judge (for example, the reports of his trouble with the priest Samuel in I Samuel 15:10ff. or the fact that he looked around for any good fighter he could find, I Samuel 14:52), but this is probably essentially correct. In fact, it may well be that a good part of his trouble was the fact that he could not really be a king on the "new model," yet he could not be the old style judge either. Israel needed more than that to survive, which she got in the person of David. To this picture of Saul, which we have added to that already at hand, we should recall to mind the discussion of David which we had seen before in the three opening sections of this chapter. We have already seen the beginning of the reign of Solomon in the Court History of David, and it is at this point that we shall pick up our historical investigation of kingship as we proceed into the part of the Deuteronomic History called the books of the Kings.

The Books of the Kings. As we move into the books of the Kings, we notice the fact that the sources of the Deuteronomic History are mentioned more often. The Deuteronomist knows quite well that he is not giving all the facts that exist, he is giving an interpretation of the facts. In the earlier portions of his history he did occasionally cite his sources like a good scholar (for example, the book of Jashar in Joshua 10:13 and II Samuel 1:18), but we are referred to the original works for the primary facts quite often (for example, the book of the Acts of

Solomon in I Kings 11:41; the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Israel in I Kings 15:19, 31 and 16:14; the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah in I Kings 15:29; 16:7, 23.³⁸

Our first concern will be to pick up the account of Solomon where we left it in the discussion of the Court History of David. As we saw, Solomon had come to power by the intercession of forces which were not those of the old Israelite stock. In addition to the arguments presented there, one may also cite the fact that Nathan the prophet may well be from the old cult of the city³⁹ as well as the priest Zadok. As an example of the type of situation we shall find ourselves in with Solomon, we can cite the first verse that occurs after the statement: "So the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon" (I Kings 2:46b). In I Kings 3:1 we read that "Solomon made a marriage alliance with Pharaoh king of Egypt." As soon as he has the throne, he wants to secure it in the manner of all royalty, by marriage.⁴⁰ Another indication of the change which has come over Israel is the civil service which we see. Solomon, evidently soon after his accession to the throne, greatly expanded the civil service and the means of raising money.⁴¹ The important changes for our purposes are those of the administrative districts and the levy from the peoples of Israel;⁴² the importance of this lies in the fact that Solomon is breaking down the old tribal structure. His districts did not necessarily coincide with the old boundaries of the tribes of Israel, which would seem to show a lack of concern for what Israel had been and an interest in her becoming what all the nations around were; Israel was to become the international power that she was with a vengeance! There is a problem with the districting of Judah; the list in Joshua 15:20-62 seems

to show that some districting was done there; but the question is: when? Some think that this was done in the reign of David;⁴³ another school, that this occurred much later.⁴⁴ In any case, the old tribal confederation is gone, gone for good; and a typical, Near Eastern kingdom has taken its place, at least so far as the rulers were concerned.

As part of this great change which took place, there was a great building campaign⁴⁵ that evidently really changed the physical appearance of much of the Empire (since that is really what we now have). Some of the building which was done (not really the most important actually) is directly part of the religious life of Israel from that time on, the famous Temple which was built by Solomon. We read that Solomon was contacted by Hiram of Tyre when he (Hiram) heard that Solomon had become king in place of David, "for Hiram always loved David" (I Kings 5:1, Eng.). Indeed, we do know that David had always got along well with Hiram if the account we have in II Samuel 5:11 means anything. Solomon, however, is doing much more than just getting along with him. They enter into quite an agreement, Solomon supplying food for Hiram (I Kings 5:9, 11) and Hiram providing timber and helping Solomon build the Temple. Without going into a description of the Temple,⁴⁶ some things must be said about it and its importance for Israel. In the first place, the fact that Hiram was connected with the building (some of his men were the most important workmen—I Kings 7:14f.) has some meaning for us. Tyre was just getting started itself as an important city commercially;⁴⁷ building on this information and other pieces, J. Morgenstern has written an article to show, among other things, that Hiram completely revamped the religious

cult in Tyre.⁴⁸ The cult is reformed from a simple agricultural Astarte cult into the "solar religion of the Tyrian empire."⁴⁹

We know from other sources that the temple which Hiram had built for Solomon was built on Phoenician lines as one would expect.⁵⁰ As a part of this general picture, some of the items with which the Temple was provided were also of Phoenician religious influence. For example, the bronze "sea" (I Kings 7:23ff.) may well have some roots in the Canaanite idea of the god Sea (Yam).⁵¹ All by itself, this might not mean anything to us; after building the Temple, Hiram may just have gone off and left Israel alone and Solomon may just have had a nice little Yahwistic cult in the royal chapel. This may be the case, but there does seem to be a good deal of evidence to the contrary. In the first and most obvious place, we see in I Kings 11:1ff. that Solomon built altars to Chemosh and Molech because of his wives. It may be true that he built the "high places" because of his wives, but this still means that his concern was for his wives and not for the Yahwism which he is supposed to have been supporting. One would expect that the Temple and anything else which was supposed to be sacred to Yahweh would have some sort of Yahwistic overtone, but the very fact that Solomon seems little concerned with the old ways and the old religion is indicative of the fact that we can expect much syncretism. That the Temple cult was sacred to Yahweh can be seen by the story in I Kings 8 in which Solomon brings the ark to the Temple in fulfillment of the prophecy of Nathan, which is referred to (I Kings 8:18, 19; cf. II Samuel 7).⁵²

In the article by Morgenstern which was referred to above, he

goes on to draw that parallel between the temple of Hiram and the Temple of Solomon so exactly that "the Yahweh of Solomon was transformed from a nomadic, or, more precisely, from a partly nomadic and partly agricultural, deity into a god distinctly solar in character."⁵³ There he also cites an article of his which would show that the Temple was oriented so that the sun would enter the Holy of holies on New Year's day, so that the assembled crowd would really think that the kebhodh Yahweh had really come. Morgenstern would even picture Yahweh as being a dying-and-rising deity as has been seen in the "Myth-and-Ritual" ~~school~~ of England and the "Uppsala" school of Sweden.⁵⁴ The picture of what was really within the debhir and what it looked like on New Year's day is given by him, as follows:

What stood within the debir of Solomon's Temple, precisely like what stood within the temple of Melcarth at Tyre, as the visible symbol of the presence of that deity within his sanctuary, was an empty throne, a throne of gold with a golden footstool. And as the kebod Yahweh shone into the debir of the Temple, between the drawn curtains, lighted upon this empty, golden throne and illumined it with wondrous radiance, it must have seemed to those who beheld this awesome sight that Yahweh had indeed ascended His throne and taken His place thereon as King.⁵⁵

Without going into any more of the picture of syncretism as given by Morgenstern, this writer would like to express some agreement with him at this point. The evidence we have shows that some sort of Phoenician influence came into Israel at this time. Part of this description of the type of influence which is given us in this article would be acceptable to the writer, most would not; basically, for the reason Morgenstern himself gives: there is no evidence.⁵⁶

Evidence that is within the sources we have is that given by the

books of the Kings about the priestly activity of Solomon, particularly I Kings 8, even though this has many marks of later cultic ideas and usages.

This all may give some insight into the reason that we have considered that the thought of some sort of "adoptive kingship" as seen in II Samuel 7:14 is more likely to have entered the Israelite cultus in the time of Solomon at the earliest than to have entered at the time of David as the text of the prophecy as it stands would have us believe. More will be seen of this and of the meaning of what is there in the next chapter of this paper when we investigate the witness of the Psalter to the institution and theology of kingship. The first great evidence of syncretism can be seen here and it seems, therefore, more logical to believe that it is at this time that the other incursions which we can possibly see in the psalms might have achieved prominence.

One other point will be raised at this time. We know the later importance of the Temple for the religion of Israel, and so we tend to read this importance back into the time of Solomon. That it was important as the shrine of the ark is without doubt; as witness the various texts. However, there is a real question about the exact importance of this royal chapel as the day-to-day religious influence of the people. If the Temple is not the center of the religious life of the people, then the actual importance of the cult of the king which we may see here or later in our discussion may not have the importance which we read into the situation. That this is exactly the case will be the point at which we shall look as we move beyond the reign of Solomon to examine the historical situation of the divided monarchy. Not only will we be able to

see the differing respect in which the institution, as well as the house of David, was held, we may also see the extent to which the influence of this cult was the center of the religious life; though this writer would be the first to admit the importance of the Jerusalem Temple, he does feel that we see more to it in the early period than was actually there for the average man-in-the-bus.

According to I Kings 11:41ff. Solomon reigned for forty years, died and was buried in the city of David; his son Rehoboam came to power then. It is interesting that we see no mention, particularly, of the manner in which Rehoboam came to power in Judah; it is just stated that he did come to power in the place of Solomon, his father. There is a difference when we come to the situation in Israel; Rehoboam has to go to the old northern center of Shechem to meet the elders of Israel, presumably to make the covenant with them which his grandfather David had had to make before they would accept him (I Kings 12:1; see for David, II Samuel 5:3). Evidently some of the exactions which Solomon had laid upon them were too heavy and they wanted these repealed; on the advice of his young advisors, those who would have no memory of what Israel had been like, he acted like a typical king of the Near East and said that he would do even more than his father had done (I Kings 12:12ff.); Israel would not take that and we have the famous answer to Rehoboam: "What portion have we in David? We have no inheritance in the son of Jesse. To your tents, O Israel!" (I Kings 12:16). The summary, given in a rather sad voice, which tells us of the view of Judah toward this, is in I Kings 12:19: "So Israel has been in rebellion against the house of David to this day." Israel felt no real tie to the house of David or to the idea

of an hereditary kingship. She might need to have a king, but there was no hint of the hereditary basis for succession. In Israel the king ruled, but only on the plane of the necessity for someone to lead; there were none of the sacral traditions which we may see in the south.⁵⁷ No, the tradition in the north was that the ruler was chosen by a prophet of Yahweh, or, at least, by the word of Yahweh (see, for example, I Kings 11:26ff. for Jeroboam and I Kings 16:1ff. for Jehu, the next dynasty). Granted that this is part of the theology of the Deuteronomist, there is also something in this; after all, it is in the north that the prophetic revolution begins and Elijah speaks against the king and the religious situation found in Israel. We do see in the north some hint of the fact that it is not the king or the institution of kingship which is important, but it is Yahweh Who is King and it is His prophet who speaks for Him. After we have seen this, we can see the reason for the remarks made about the "northern" flavor of the E-document (p. 134). We can expect, then, that any document or source emanating from a group imbued with the theology of Israel will find little importance in the institution. This does, of course, hold for the Deuteronomist also.

In Judah, on the other hand, the house of David stayed on the throne until Jerusalem fell.⁵⁸ Though it was not the important center of the empire which it had been during the reigns of David and Solomon, it did contain the Temple which will make Zion more and more a holy place for Israel (at least in the records which we have, records which give us, basically, a Judaite orientation). This close connection between the house of David and the city of David continues down to the exile and pro-

vides the basis for the importance which the house of David has for messianic speculation along with Zion, the holy place of Yahweh (which we cannot investigate at all in this paper, but see S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. G. W. Anderson: New York, Abingdon Press, no date.)

To finish the discussion of the cult, so far as we can see it in the Deuteronomic History, we must note a few things. The first is that Jeroboam emulated the royal cult in Jerusalem as soon as he could, supposedly because he was afraid that all of his subjects would go down to Jerusalem to worship there (I Kings 12:25ff.). Though the Deuteronomic editor may have overstressed the importance of Jerusalem because of his views of Jerusalem, there is no doubting the fact that Jeroboam did build opposing shrines and have an opposing feast. This fact would lend a good deal of credence to the importance given to the royal cult by many people; at the least, it does show us that there could be no completely secular acts by the king, particularly in Israel.

The other important pieces of evidence which we must look at are those showing us that the cult in Jerusalem (or even the royal sanctuaries in Bethel and Dan in the north) was not all that the people had. Asa, king of Judah (913-873), is one of the few kings in the Deuteronomist's estimation really to be a good king, following in the ways of David, his father (I Kings 15:11). With all the things he does to strengthen Yahwism he does not take away all the high places (I Kings 15:14). It is perfectly possible for someone in those times to worship at his own "high place" most of the time and then worship at the king's Temple when he went up to the "big city" as many farmers do eventually; but many people

must have found the "high places" a very important part of their life. We really need look no further for evidence of this kind; the only importance it has is to remind us of the fact that we tend to look at the Jerusalem cult, particularly looking back through the eyes of Deuteronomy and the priestly writers when Jerusalem is the sanctuary. This makes us think that the evidence of some sort of royal cult found in Jerusalem must be all that there is in all of Israel and that everyone in Israel spent all his worshiping hours there. We do need this corrective to that, admitting all the while that the Jerusalem cult did become the one cult for Israel, finally.

Summary

Rather than try to summarize what was seen in each of the various sources examined, we shall look briefly at the results of all of the examination, how it all fits together, before we go on to see if we can get any clues for some of the theology of kingship as given in the psalms.

The first thing to note is that we saw a progression in the development from Saul to Solomon. In Saul we saw a man who had come to power in the old charismatic fashion, called by Yahweh. He tried to rule as one of the old judges had, also (with some changes, of course—he did hire mercenaries; e. g., David). His try at being a loyal Yahwist of the old style failed because the times needed a new style and a better man, so far as fighting goes. This new style man was found in David, the beau ideal of the king for ever after. David was a good Yahwist; he was also a good general and statesman, so he beat off the Philistines and then established his house. To do this, he went to a neutral center,

Jerusalem, where he could establish his own tradition. Wisely, he made it a Yahwistic center, too, by the placement of the ark in it.

The big change comes with the death of David. We see that some sort of covenant has been made by Yahweh with David (this would be quite logical since the only real religious bond the Israelites knew was the Covenant; it would be typical of David's wisdom to use it) and his house. There has also had to be a covenant with Israel, separate from the one with Judah, which will be important later. Solomon comes to power by the support of the forces which do not represent the old Yahwistic forces, either of the host of Israel or of the priesthood. His ~~supporters~~ supporters are the new crowd and his type of kingship is definitely of the new type, modeled on the Near Eastern idea, with many of the Near Eastern ideas entering. We see the Phoenician temple cult put up (though Solomon has enough wisdom to make it Yahwistic by the placement of the ark in it); we see the evidence of all the syncretism which comes in at this time, and we see why the theology of the king which is represented by the term adopted son could well have entered at this time.

Kingship after the death of Solomon remains as it had been in Judah, but there is a change in Israel. We see the outbreak of the Yahwistic, anti-monarchical theology which will plague that kingdom the rest of its days and which will be represented in many of the strata of the Old Testament.

Now let us look a little more closely to the theology of the institution of kingship which we have seen briefly in our treatment of II Samuel 7, Nathan's prophecy.

Chapter IV

THE PSALMS

Introduction

In the introductory chapter of this paper we saw that it was out of the study of the psalms that the entire, original discussion of the place of the king and the institution and theology of kingship developed. For this reason and the reason that the psalms do present certain aspects of the theology of kingship rather more clearly than the hints we have seen in the historical books, there must be some discussion of the psalms in any treatment of the theology of kingship in Israel, even a treatment as brief and superficial as this one.

The basic plan of this chapter is based on that of our previous discussions and investigations. The two points which came out most clearly in the earlier chapters, particularly from II Samuel 7, the prophecy of Nathan, were the points concerning the covenant with David and so with his house (which was explicitly mentioned in II Samuel 23, the "Last Words of David") and concerning the theory of "adoptive sonship." The importance of these for our investigations is obvious, but the brief glimpse which has been seen may possibly need further amplification. This we may hope to find in the psalms.

To develop those two differing theologies or theories, we shall first discuss four psalms, two of which are particularly famous for being among Gunkel's "royal psalms": psalms 2 and 110. The other two which we shall investigate briefly are: psalms 78 and 89. These four will form the basis of our discussion; the remainder of the psalter—royal psalms

and all—will be discussed collectively in a section following the individual psalms.

The order followed in our discussion of the psalms will not be according to any chronology this time but will be according to the types of theology shown, beginning with psalm 78, then going to psalm 89, thirdly to psalm 2 and finally psalm 110. And after the individual psalms have been investigated, the psalter as a collection will be discussed.

Psalm 78

This psalm is not one usually connected with any of the royal psalms or with any theology of the king. For one thing, it is probably late, showing the ideas of the Chronicler. "In Form und Inhalt ist Ps. 78 verwandt mit der Leviten predigt des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes, unterscheidet sich allerdings in der poetischen Gestalt."¹ In fact, the use usually made of it is in connection with the cultic "Credo" which G. von Rad has traced, mostly in the Pentateuch.² The importance which we see here lies in vv. 70ff., in which the words—"He chose David his servant, and took him from the sheepfolds . . ."—appear. This reminds us of II Samuel 7:8, in which we read: ". . . I took you from . . . following the sheep, that you should be prince over my people Israel."

The verses in which David is mentioned are the culmination of the psalm and represent the point toward which the singer has been moving in his recital of the events which he sees in God's plan for His people. David is the final installment of those divine, saving acts. The theology is definitely that of the south, of Judah, and the picture which we

receive is that of the chosen house of David fulfilling Yahweh's plan. The institution of kingship is a "good thing" (to quote that famous history of England entitled 1066 and All That) and is being used by Yahweh. We have seen something of this before in the J-document as well as in Nathan's prophecy; and it represents something of an adaptation of the very old Israelite idea of Yahweh's "choosing" someone. It is a very short step from this point to the idea of the choice establishing a covenant with David; certainly, we may see that the ideas are allied in our sources.

Psalm 89

With psalm 89 we enter into the realm of difficulty. The psalm which we have just finished discussing, psalm 78, is not really a problem to anyone and all the commentaries agree to a very large extent. In this case, there is a large area of agreement but also a large area of disagreement, mostly in connection with II Samuel 7: a question of the direction of dependency, if any. But that will be mentioned at the proper place.

The decision of Gunkel to place this psalm in the category which he called "mixed" (Mischgedichte), a form which is taken as a blend of types, gives us a good example of this influence of this man on psalm criticism. The majority of commentators follow him in finding several types here and, indeed, in finding a development from an original, ancient hymn.³ Its last section—vv. 39-52 (Eng. 38-52)—gives it its present place as a "Lament" by the king over some repulse or setback; but this last section is probably not nearly so old as the earliest sec-

tions and, in any case, does not concern us. The three sections of the psalm which do concern us are: (1) the first five verses, (2) verses 6-19 and (3) verses 20-38.⁴

The first section, which is probably quite old, is a statement to the effect that a covenant has been made with David and that his house will stand forever. We have seen this before; it seems that all of our investigations lead us to the prophecy which we first saw in II Samuel 7 and the same thing is true here, too. The only difference which we can see is that there is no mention of the covenant in Nathan's prophecy; and this "dynastic oracle" does mention the covenant with David, recalling what little could be seen in the "Last Words of David" in II Samuel 23. On the final analysis, this short piece does sound as if it were connected with a dynastic oracle giving some description of the covenant with David and what it concerned. However, little more than this can be seen; there is really so little here that no real impression can be gained. It could go back to Davidic times; if it does, it tells us very little more about the theology which was extant there than we have already known—that David did have some "covenant" with Yahweh and this shows his reign was sanctioned as a Yahwistic institution.

The second section is probably the oldest part of the psalm. The imagery goes back to the motif of the divine council which is found in Ugarit and generally in Palestine.⁵ There are other Canaanitic motifs to be found in the section and this does give some support to the contention of Ahlström that the entire psalm "ist rein jerusalemisch"⁶ in which he would include the Canaanitish Jebusite elements which we have

before us. Other than to show us that there was Canaanite influence upon the psalm literature of Israel and that this influence may have been part of the legacy of the conquering of Jerusalem, we need not pause here; our further interest lies in the next section.

The third section of this psalm (vv. 20-38) seems to be later than the preceding sections.⁷ It is also in this section that the discussion really involves II Samuel 7; in fact, some have raised the question of the priority of this psalm over that of Nathan's prophecy.⁸ Without trying to evade the issue, there is a good deal of justice in the suggestion of Johnson⁹ that both the prophecy and the poetry found in the psalm come from the same general source, the Temple cult of Jerusalem.

What are the contents of this section of the psalm? We can find both the covenant idea (in v. 29) and the view which we saw in II Samuel 7:14 of an adoptive sonship (vv. 27, 28). At this time we shall not discuss the meaning of adoption any more than we did when it came up in our discussion of the Former Prophets. This matter will be given more consideration at greater length when the next section is reached, that section concerned with psalm 2; at that time some of the ideas which lie behind the term and some of the meaning we can find in its use in Israel will be mentioned. So far as we can come to any conclusion here, this much will be said: the fact that both the covenant with David and the "adoptive sonship" are placed together in this part of the psalm bespeaks of the fact that both of these ideas were extant for the author to use. This is not evidence for any original connection between the two nor that the roots of the prophecy of Nathan lie here (mostly because, while the

imagery and language are similar, there is the fact that the covenant with David is not mentioned by Nathan and it would be if there were the dependency which has been postulated).

While there may very well be quite ancient roots to the first two sections of this psalm, the third is later and is not evidence of original thought concerning the theology of kingship; it is derivative and is possible evidence of cultic activity at a time when the two ideas of covenant with David and adoptive sonship of the king by God had become allied. This should make this third part come later than the reign of David, from what we have seen so far, though admittedly it could come as early as the reign of Solomon.

Psalm 2

In psalm 2 we meet the first of the psalms which is completely and without doubt a member of the Gattung of the "royal psalms." This is the position in which Gunkel¹⁰ placed it, and this is where it has remained ever since. It is usually considered to be part of the king's ritual in the New Year's Festival.¹¹ We have not given too much consideration to the thought of some festival in which the king would yearly be newly enthroned or in which Yahweh was enthroned in annual festival as King over the world, as Mowinckel would have it.¹² We have seen that there was some sort of festival in which the king took a part and this was particularly important in the face of the split between Israel and Judah after the death of Solomon. The reason for the lack of stress in this paper on such a festival is twofold: in the first place, most of our information about the theology of the institution of kingship is

drawn from the narrative sources and not from the psalms in which the usual framework of the festival is found; in the second place, the usual formulation of the festival will not add to our investigation materially. We are not investigating the probability of such a festival and just what it contains; so we shall accept the findings of others where necessary as to the exact content and use of the psalms (in this case, psalm 2) as a source for theology and not festivals.

Again, in this psalm we are interested in only a few of the verses which it contains. Outside of the comment about the "anointed" of Yahweh (which form we have seen often before as standard Israelite terminology) we want to look a little more closely at the meaning of the seventh verse: "I will tell of the decree of the Lord: He said to me, 'You are my son, today I have begotten you.' " (Psalm 2:7) This verse has been one of those used for proof of the entrance of Canaanite theology of the sacral character of the king into the theology of Israel. The old critical idea was that the influence came from Babylon as part of an ancient Near East "pattern" and it is with this idea that the name of the so-called "Myth and Ritual" school is associated. The man who was responsible for the book of essays which put forth this view of the "pattern," S. H. Hooke, has now changed his view to the extent that he feels that Assyrian influence was probably mediated through Canaan.¹³ With the discovery and translation of the tablets from Ugarit in northern Palestine on the coast, this idea became much stronger. We shall show some of the evidence which has been deduced for the "divine sonship" in Canaan. There are several references to the king being the son of the god in the legend of King Keret.¹⁴ Of this evidence, though, it has been said that

"the title 'son of god' denotes not a natural, but a sacramental relationship; it is a social category."¹⁵ This is arrived at through the observation that others besides the king can be called the son of god, even if the king is considered to be in a special relationship with the god. What does that have to say to us? In the first place, not too much directly, since Ugarit was destroyed in the fourteenth century B. C. and Israel did not really come on the scene until the year 1,000 B. C. or thereabouts. Not only that, but we do not know if there was any direct influence between the areas. However, it is true that Ugarit may be able to be used as an example of the kind of mythology and "theology" which was around in Canaan and Palestine at the time.

So far as our purpose is concerned, we may assume that some such theology as adoptive sonship was "in the air," so to speak. What then? Does this mean that when our psalmist speaks of Yahweh saying "You are my son, today I have begotten you" (Psalm 2:7), we must see the same as the theology we see in Canaan? To an extent, yes. We have seen that the great influx of non-Israelitish influence came in during the reign of Solomon; but even then, one is not required to assume that these words must be taken literally. This writer thinks that the clue to the use of this type of phraseology here, in Psalm 89, and in other places where it occurs is to be given us by that same chapter of II Samuel which we have found occasion to refer to so often. In Nathan's prophecy in II Samuel 7:14 Yahweh is represented as saying, "I will be his father, and he shall be my son." The picture here is one of the family, the close relationship between father and son. Since the Hebrew family society was very

patriarchal, the father was very important and he "set the tone" of the family and his influence was the influence of the entire family.¹⁶ We have seen that there are hints of this type of thinking in the Canaanite materials (if Dr. Gray is correct); in the case of Israel, this close relationship would be the way a relationship of the king and Yahweh could be expressed. It is within the mythical structure, it may carry mythical overtones (if they are there at this time); but the relationship may well have also reflected the Hebrew family.

There may be, then, two influences to be found in the use of the term adopted son; the Canaanite influence (the exact meaning of which is not certain) and the Israelite. This would result in a relationship stronger and less "truly" Israelite than the covenant ideal which David had used, but it could be used as a vehicle for the religious life of Israel even in the midst of the syncretistic reign of Solomon and his successors.

Psalm 110

This royal psalm is difficult for the various exegetes to explain and to place in some sort of proper perspective. For our purposes there are two verses which we must examine. Unfortunately, both of them are among the ones which give the most trouble to the exegetes. Part of our difficulty may arise from the fact that verse 3 has a particularly corrupt text and it provides some of the "background" with which one moves on to verse 4. In any case, the difficulty of this psalm has meant that a field-day could be had in its interpretation¹⁷ and exposition. As Kraus points out (along with almost everyone else!), the roots of this

psalm definitely lie in the general ethos of the ancient Near East; but what is the meaning for Israel?

In verse 3 the text is so corrupt that almost every person has a different translation.¹⁸ There is some unanimity, however, on the fact that somehow this verse is connected with the birth of the king in relationship with the god. Kraus calls it the "wunderbare himmlische Geburt des irdischen Königs."¹⁹ This is more than the adoptive sonship which we have seen before; however, the setting is so corrupt that one really cannot base much on this verse. If we accept the suggestion of Johnson that this deals with the cultic rebirth,²⁰ we can see that we have the same situation here that we had in the previous psalm (Psalm 2). There is a connection between rebirth and being the adopted son of the god; they both come as the act of the god and they both mean that, at a point in time, the person (king) enters a new relationship with the god. From this standpoint, then, we can see that this psalm fits into the same framework which we have seen before.

In the next verse we return to the reference to Melchizedek, which we discussed briefly in chapter II. The king is called a priest "for ever after the order of Melchizedek." There is here a reference to the old priest-kings of Jerusalem,²¹ as we saw before. In the light of the succeeding discussion concerning the history of the institution of kingship in Israel, we can see why the comment was made at that time that the reign of Solomon might be better than the reign of David for the entrance of this factor into the history of the religion of Israel. This is not to say, of course, that David did not act as a priest on oc-

casion; we saw the evidence of that above. The point here is that the king is given the title of priest-king; he is the important figure in the cult, but here he is important as the priest. This may give us some explanation of the evidence which we saw for Solomon's and others' acting as priests at times. This adds another facet to the theology of kingship and one which accords with the type of relationship we have tentatively postulated for the "adoptive" sonship, but which does not accord at all well with the type of theology of kingship which has the king taking the part of god in the ritual, etc.

The Royal Psalms

This is not a new category or term to us since we saw it used in connection with some of the previous psalms we have discussed (Psalms 2 and 110). In this section we are going to look at those psalms which Gunkel has classified as "Royal"; i. e., those psalms which are concerned with the king and his activities. We have already discussed two of them (Psalms 2 and 110); now we shall consider the remaining ones as a group. They are (using the classification and decision of Gunkel as our base): Psalms 18, 20, 21, 45, 72, 101, 132 and 144:1-11.²² These will not be handled as individual in the manner of those above or even individually in a more brief manner; we shall point out some of the themes which are present and then take a brief look at one verse which is especially important from what it possibly represents even if this is not an important theme in the Old Testament as a whole.

There are two themes which we may note recurring in these psalms in general: that of the trust of the king in Yahweh and that of the need

for the righteousness of the king. For example, in Psalm 18 we find: "For who is God, but the Lord? And who is a rock, except our God? - the God who girded me with strength, and made my way safe." (Vv. 32, 33; Eng., vv. 31, 32) The king has trust in Yahweh because He is the one who "delivered (him) from (his) strong enemy . . . " (v. 18; Eng., v. 17). Or, in Psalm 20 we have the shout of trust of the king, saying, "Now I know that the Lord will help his anointed; he will answer him from his holy heaven . . . " (v. 7; Eng., v. 6).

The other major theme which we can see in these psalms is that of the necessity of the king for righteousness. For example, again in Psalm 18, we read that "the Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness . . . " (v. 21; Eng., v. 20); or we might refer to the entirety of Psalm 101.

These two themes are brought together really in Psalm 18 as we saw since both are there and it seems as if the help which the king trusts Yahweh to give depends on the fact of his (the king's) righteousness. In a sense, this may have nothing to do with our search for a theology of the institution of kingship; but, on the other hand, there is strong connection. The king is placed on his throne and is kept there by Yahweh as long as he is himself righteous. (More about this theme below.) Implicitly, however, this is saying that it is not the fact of the king's being the king which is important; it is the fact that he has been placed there by Yahweh and that he is only placed there for "righteousness' sake," so to speak. The king is realized to be limited by the law, the law of Yahweh Who put him there.

One of the real cruces interpretum to be found in the Psalter is found in Psalm 45. This is the famous, or infamous, verse 7, Eng. v. 6, which says in Hebrew: **כסאך יושב ויהיה שולל ויחיה**. The RSV gives one translation and places two more in the footnotes. The Germans are more confident; they, at least the two commentaries which are being depended upon here, give the translation something like this: "Dein Thron, O Göttlicher, (steht) immer und ewig . . ." ²³ The best textual and syntactical discussion is in Kraus; ²⁴ but see also, North for a good defense of another view. ²⁵ By taking this German view of the translation of the verse, one is not saying that this is the theology of kingship in the Old Testament. As Kraus points out, ²⁶ this is an adaptation of the "adoption" sonship which we have seen before; if it does mean exactly what it says (disregarding any hyperbole, which often does seem to be part of the poetic literature), we can with North say that "one swallow doesn't make a summer." ²⁷ The author of the psalm may very well have included the king within the sphere of the "gods" himself, but this theology is unattested elsewhere in the Old Testament and seems to show no implicit influence. For this reason we shall disregard it from this point on.

In Psalm 132 we have another psalm which has been used for many purposes in the discussion of kingship and festivals in Israel. ²⁸ We shall note that there are many reminiscences here of the covenant with David which we discussed in Psalm 89 and also saw in II Samuel 23. ²⁹ One of the reasons for the importance of this psalm is the fact that it mentions the entrance of the ark into Zion, which Yahweh has chosen. It

is on the basis of this psalm (and, of course, some of the historical narrative and other psalms) that many people have given great stress to the entrance of the ark into Jerusalem when David really made Jerusalem the central cult-site of Israel (see above). As we have said before (page 32), the importance of the ark and its presence in Jerusalem is incalculable; here we have the choice of David and his dynasty tied together with the choice of Zion as Yahweh's "resting place." As we mentioned above, the importance of Jerusalem came not from David but from the ark; and this psalm gives us added confirmation of that fact and adds the warning not to forget the ark when evaluating the importance of the king in the religious life and thought of the people of Israel.

Summary

Our discussion of the psalms has not really led us to any new ideas (unless one wishes to mention Psalm 45) which we may use in our search for information about "sacral" kingship in Israel. The majority of the facts we can see have already been seen in the discussion which preceded this chapter of the historical narratives. There are still the two themes which we found in II Samuel 7 and II Samuel 23 of the covenant with David and the adoptive sonship. In these pieces of cultic literature (for we must agree with those who so term them) those two ideas do reappear and, in fact, they reappear together (as in Psalm 89). Some of the terminology used in the psalms, however, is much more reminiscent of that to be found in other literature of the ancient Near East and this may well show that there is a connection with the cultural and religious surrounding (which we had already seen), which one might expect just on

the face of things. The thing which one must note, however, is that this terminology and these forms of speech and of address of deity have been used in Israel and they seem to have been adapted somewhat from what they were originally.³⁰

These do show signs of having been used liturgically, but then that is an accepted point of scholarship now (obviously, they were used liturgically in the second Temple, but this refers to the first Temple.) They show us how the king was referred to in the cult and what some of his duties and responsibilities were; but here, as always, it does boil down to Yahweh. Yahweh had done the choosing and the anointing; and the king, even as the "adopted son," has been chosen by Him for His purposes. The king must act righteously; this is the basis for his confidence in Yahweh and that Yahweh will maintain him and his people. As a part of all this, the ark makes its appearance again to show us that we must not forget that the king is not the only item of religious importance in Jerusalem; in fact, not the most important.

The priestly functions of the king were seen again and a bit more deeply in the psalms (to be specific, Psalm 110). Not only does this give us a connection with the old Jebusite Jerusalem (as we mentioned in chapter I in the discussion of Genesis 14), but it shows another form of the activity of the king, one which must not be forgotten. The priestly functions we have seen performed do not seem to be those of a particularly "sacred" king (but more of this in the next chapter).

All of this we have seen before in one form or another, but these psalms which we have investigated have given us confirmation of a

particularly valuable sort; they not only confirmed what we have observed before in the narrative sections of the Old Testament, but they have also been seen in those sections of the literature of the Bible which people consider the heart of any theology of the king (forgetting, many of them, that most of the psalms we have are from the Jerusalemite cult and, therefore, do not give us a balanced picture). It is gratifying, therefore, to see that the picture of the king which we have presented from the narrative is to be found there also.

Excursus on the Chronicler

The Chronicler is the author of the historical books in the section of the Old Testament we have just been discussing, the Hagiographa or Writings. This history comprises the four (in our Bibles) books of Ezra, Nehemiah and First and Second Chronicles. The fact that these books are in the Hagiographa in the Hebrew text is the reason for this position, following the Psalms rather than the chapter in which we considered the narrative and historical books.

The date of these writings must at least be carried down to circa 400 B. C. since the history goes down to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. This, in itself, might cause some concern about the reliability of the source; but when this is added to the usual decision about the very tendentious sort of history ("The Chronistic historiography is 'dogmatic historiography'"³¹) which we see in these books, there is a good deal of concern about the usefulness of the work of the Chronicler.

We have seen the general plan which is given in the work of the

Priestly writer (in chapter II above); this is continued and brought "up to date" by the Chronicler. The important things to note may be given in the dual purpose of the work: "Chron. want to stress the legitimacy of the Davidic kingdom and the Jerusalemite temple as the genuine Holy Place of Yahweh."³² While we may not see a theological position which we can give as information about the early stages of the religion of Israel, we can see something of what has happened in the later stages of this religion, especially with regard to our interest, the king. That David has a "position in Chron. nearly parallel to that of Moses,"³³ then we can expect the king to be very important, at least the Davidic line. This we see; we also see history written from the point of view of someone who knows only Judah and so can see the kingship only in a favorable light. However, individual kings can be evil and wicked (see, e. g., the picture of Ahaz in II Chronicles 28); but this does not mean that kingship is evil, only the king as a person.

Chapter V

CONCLUSION

In every evaluation of evidence there is the danger that the "forest may be lost for the trees"; we may become so involved with the minute evidence of one verse or with the story which one source must tell us that we forget just what the Bible is telling us in total. With all the conflicting stories which we get we must be able to reach some sort of general over-all picture. It is important to know why we have a different picture of the religious situation in Israel given us by the E-writer from that of the J-writer; it is very important and it must be held in mind while evaluating the contents of the source; it is equally important to be able to read the consistent story which the two together present about that religious situation in Israel. It is this very important task of assimilation and synthesis which lies ahead of us now.

Before we can proceed with that work of synthesis, there is one point on which we must refresh ourselves. The documents or sources of the various books which we have discussed grew themselves out of the cultural and historical situation in which the authors or compilers found themselves. There has been occasion to note this in connection with the writers of the E-document, the P-code and the Deuteronomic history, for example. This factor must still be kept in mind as we proceed with the attempt to build some coherent picture of the institution of kingship in Israel; it will be very important as we try to take a final look at the history we have seen from the perspective of a later time and see the effect of the subject of our investigation in its period and

later.

So much for the caveat lector and introductory remarks. From this point on we must see if we can review what has come before in our discussion and find any pattern emerging which is consistent with the evidence as presented (and with that not presented also if it is relevant).

The development which we shall follow will be roughly historical from Saul through David to Solomon and later. When we have seen the history again, we shall try to achieve a balanced view of the institution as it appeared in history and as it appears in the religion of Israel. When this is done, we should have an answer to the question of the place that kingship held in Israel, the extent to which it has sacral character and we should have some basis on which to look at the surviving documents and read them.

First, then, our historical summary. We began with Saul, the tragic figure of Israelite rule. He came to power in Israel as one of the old charismatic figures; he was chosen by Yahweh to save His people from the Philistines; he was filled with the "spirit of Yahweh" (I Samuel 10:10); and he strove to do what the old judges of Israel had done, to free Israel from the yoke of the Philistines. He tried to be the leader of the old type, of the old type which the Yahwism of Israel had known. He tried this and saw it fail. As time went on, he must have seen that there was a need for a change in the old methods of doing things because he looked around for men to fight, not just the men of the "host of Israel" in the way that it had been done. ". . . when

Saul saw any strong man, or any valiant man, he attached him to himself" (I Samuel 14:52b). In the main, though, he tried to be a leader of the old type (naghidh), but he tried to fight an opponent which used all the new methods. It is no wonder that he could not take the strain.

David, who was evidently one of the strong, valiant men of Saul (according to one story), had much success in battle against the Philistines, more success than Saul; and the people began to leave Saul and call to David though Saul was still Yahweh's anointed and the one who was ruler or leader of Israel. David had the chance to be a man of the modern school of battle because of several very fortunate circumstances. In the first place, he was one of the mercenaries of Saul, which made him come up in new (for Israel) circumstances; also, as Saul turned against him, he was driven to being a brigand and then a mercenary of the Philistines with his own men around him, men on whom he could depend. With the Philistines, he probably learned their methods, which, when allied with his own native ability, made him a great soldier of the times. It also made him something new in the history of Israel; he was not of the old school and he did not represent the old Yahwism of the tribal confederation. This may have had effect in keeping him out of power if it had not been for the external situation, the Philistines. They forced the hand of Israel; Israel had to go to the new type of leadership, to a king on the model of "the nations," in order to survive as a nation. This is just what happened. Saul died and David became king over Judah in Hebron.

With David some new influences do come into Israel and there is

a change from the old type of tribal government and charismatic leadership which is raised by Yahweh. Now, for Judah, Yahweh has raised the house of David and this house will be with them until the fall of Jerusalem. The house of Joseph, Israel, did not accept David as king until after the death of Ishbaal, the son of Saul. At that time the tribes of the north came to David and made a covenant with him in Hebron.¹ There is evidence of discontent with the business of having a king; the anti-monarchical source represents it as rejecting Yahweh as king over Israel. This is probably representative of the feeling of some of the people, particularly in the north, Israel proper. He was anointed king over all Israel then; in his person he had joined both the sections of Israel into one. The differences between the two would remain and would break out again, but for the moment Israel and Judah were under one house, the house of David. As a part of this, David had the idea of finding himself a neutral city, one which would give offence to neither side. This he found in Jerusalem; he also found more there, he found the traditions of an old city, traditions which he could take over for himself, but which evidently did not mean too much to him. He remained a loyal Yahwist and as part of his Yahwism, the ark, the center of Yahwism, he brought to his capital, Jerusalem; this move was also indicative of his political acumen. It is impossible to say, but this writer would point to this period as the one in which the idea of the "Davidic covenant with Yahweh" (or, as the Israelites no doubt looked at, Yahweh's covenant with David) became the way of Israel's understanding the fact that she had a king like the nations (yet, not just like the nations).

The religious item of importance was the one which saw the ark come to the "city of David." Yahweh has taken up His abode in Zion, but this also has come to be connected with the king (as we saw from Psalm 132). We have seen evidence that David acted as a priest in Jerusalem; so we do know that we cannot ascribe everything just to what we would (anachronistically) call secular politics. We shall have occasion to mention this again, but we must stress the importance of the ark here. As we said above, the ark—not the king—gave the importance to Jerusalem.

To look back on David, then, we see a man who was of the new type of Israelite, who had a new type of army for Israel, yet who retained his tie with the past in the fact that he brought the ark to Jerusalem and then he used the concept of "covenant" to explain his kingship to the people of Israel (II Samuel 23:5). The combination of new and old was needed to save Israel and yet to maintain what she had been.

One might mention the difficult problem of a New Year's festival here. From what we have seen, if there was a festival of some sort, the most likely one to have is a festival connected with the ark, which has been seen by many.² In this case, the emphasis would be on the ark, not on the king (or his connection with Yahweh). If there was an annual festival, though, it did not attain anything like the importance which a festival would attain in the reign of his successor, Solomon, as we shall see now.

The death of David sees an even greater change over Israel. David, with all his "new ideas," had remained a good Yahwist. Solomon, though, has only been raised in the city of Jerusalem which is a center

of empire. He is the son of a king and he can see nothing but that. He comes to power on the backs of those in the group surrounding David which represent only the new, not the old, Yahwism. Zadok, the Jebusite priest, and Nathan, the Jebusite prophet, with the leader of the mercenary forces, Benaiah—these are his supporters (page 26); they are men who have not the traditions of Yahwism which David and the men who came to power with him had. Now Israel really begins to taken on the complexion of an ancient Near East empire. Solomon begins a great building program and, as part of it, the Temple, the "chapel royal." Built on a Phoenician model by Phoenician builders, it would be not too unusual if Phoenician and Canaanite elements became a part of the Temple cult. This is just what happened (page 48). True, this is still officially a cult of Yahweh and His ark is brought into the Temple (and may be the center of the official worship as it was in the time of David). On the other hand, we see signs of cultic ideas which are new in Israel.

It is at this time that the old Canaanitic ideas which we find in the "royal psalms" concerning the king enter (at least, no earlier than this reign). The concept of the king's being the "adopted son" of the god takes its place beside the one David had used of the covenant with Yahweh. The king now has an exalted position which he did not have before, at least in his eyes and those of the officials surrounding him. As a part of all this influence, some of the old Jebusite elements of Jerusalem may well have made their appearance at this time. With the entrance of the royal psalms, we may have the entrance of Melchizedek (as seen in Psalm 110) and the attempt at justifying the continuity of the present royal house with the priest-kings which have gone before in this

city. This is truly a time of syncretism and a time of empire in the grand manner of the ancient Near East.

So far as a cult or New Year's festival is concerned, this is the era in which something could really get a good start in Israel. The brand new Temple and the new influences which have charge of the religious life (at least, the official religious life) could be very well used in some such fashion. It is in this reign that the theology of kingship as an institution could get a real part of the religious spectrum. Still, this writer would see the evidence which has been presented as indicating that the festival of the ark retained its preëminence.

For the later history of Israel we need not do very much summarizing. It is here that the differing points of view of north and south are most apparent; it is also here that one can see just how far the kings have moved from the idea of one chosen by Yahweh and so answerable to Him to a conception of the king as one who rules his people as if they were slaves (the roots of this came in the reign of Solomon, yet it was not so baldly thrust down people's throats then as Rehoboam did after the death of his father). It is also here that we begin to get some current idea of the importance of the festival celebrated in the Temple. If Jeroboam felt that he had to build cultic centers to rival Jerusalem and the festival celebrated there, there must have been some importance given to it (even with the Deuteronomic additions we can see this). Yet, even here, we do not see the importance of the king except as priest; we see the importance of a celebration to the god(s), nothing more. The second point to note is the existence of high places all throughout the

period. There was not just one cult which everyone went to, though the cult and Temple of the king might well be the most important in the land.

If then, we stop and glance briefly back to the chapter in which we investigated the writings of the Pentateuch, we can see some of the factors which made those documents have the general outlook which they did have, especially as this touches the source of the stratum as regards place of origin or author (or compiler). It is quite understandable, in the light of the evidence we have seen, that those sources of the Pentateuch which derived from the northern tribes would have a rather dim view of the king and the institution of kingship. A source which many would regard as a continuation of E puts it very well: this was a rejection of Yahweh as king over them, so far as they were concerned (I Samuel 8:7). We would not expect to see, then, a point of view which shows us just what the king meant in Judah (and we do not). Even then, though, some of the excesses which are disapproved of are not those referring to the reign of David but to the reign of Solomon (Deuteronomy 17:14ff.). In any case, the north does not feel that kings are important as people or as kings, their only reason for existence may lie in the fact that they are necessary; even then, this must be the choice of Yahweh (and in the north Yahweh was seen as choosing several houses, not just one).

In this theology of the north we have one strand of the theology of sacral kingship which we are seeking. In Israel there does not really seem to be any that is not rejected by the backward-looking Yahwists as being a betrayal of Yahweh (although this is not to say that some of the kings of Israel might not have had ideas just like those of other Near Eastern kings).

A further look at the sources which we have examined, this time those from the southern tribes, from Judah, shows us a more favorable view of the king. J, for example, sees the king as someone who has been placed on the throne by Yahweh and as someone who, therefore, is a part of the plan of Yahweh in His gracious acts for His people, Israel. There is no trace in all this, though, of any particular importance being placed in the person of the king; he is just the agent of Yahweh, an agent who happens to be in the form of the ruler of what is now the kingdom. Another document of Judah, the Court History of David, gives us a picture which accords well with J and with the actual situation in Judah as we see it develop throughout its history. The Court History of David presents him as a man and a man who can make mistakes and be rebuked for them; he is certainly not a "sacred" figure for this writer. Yet with all this, there is the fact that the king is not looked on as a mistake as was the case in the documents from the north or of northern provenance. This more favorable light in which the king is seen is consistent with the fact that there does not seem to have been the dynastic troubles in Judah that occurred regularly in Israel. Still, though, no real picture of the king such as we get in some of the documents from Ugarit, for example (or even in the Psalms).

We must here take another look at the place which the ark played in all this. The documents as they survive give us the picture that the ark was much more important than the king in the cult, as well as other religious affairs. One must keep in mind the fact that most of our sources do come from a later time in which the ark may well be thought to have had a greater importance than it had in fact at the time. As has

been shown above (page 32), we do not believe this. The ark gave Jerusalem its importance and it probably gave the Temple its lasting importance. This was the object which was the center of the religious or devotional life of the people, not the king, from the evidence of these surviving documents.

To gain even more balance for our final decision, we must recall that numbers of "high places" or cultic sites were around the country side. Calling the Temple the chapel-royal is overstressing the case, but there is some justification for it. In the city of Jerusalem itself and in the surrounding territory the Temple probably represented the central cult; for the rest, it was the center, no doubt, but the effect that it would have on the people would probably be rather small. We must remember this, too, in our evaluation of kingship. Whatever we see in Jerusalem, this may well be restricted to Jerusalem the city and not be very representative of the situation in (all) Israel as a whole. The ultimate importance is, of course, the fact that the Temple and the central cult there survived and the rest did not; we can accept this as the final and ultimate importance and still recognize that things were much different at the time.

One might add a parenthetical note here about the prophets. As we mentioned in the introductory chapter, this paper could not give the consideration due them to the prophets. For the most part, their evidence is to the conditions as existing in their own time, which is not our problem directly; secondly, the difficulty in interpreting the evidence is itself a topic for a very detailed investigation. However, it is at this point in our investigation here that the witness of the pro-

phets could be very useful. We can do no more than evaluate our results in the light of such a study, however, and pass on.

Has all the study and investigation which we have done accomplished anything toward answering the question with which we began? One can only hope that it has. One strand of our answer was seen in its strongest possible fashion in the sources of the north. The king was only important so far as he was chosen by Yahweh. This was true in the north; and this was also true in Judah so far as we can see. Even in the Jerusalem cult at the height of the syncretistic period under Solomon, even then, the king was not the center of life to the extent that he was in the other ancient Near Eastern kingdoms.³ Yahweh had to be the giver of the relationship in all cases. Even in the use of the title son of God by Solomon and those following the original act of adoption was by Yahweh; it was His act and His choice. Our evidence seems to have shown us the picture which we see most clearly in the Court History of David and the J-document, that the king is a man chosen by Yahweh for His purposes, given a special relationship with Yahweh (described in several ways, "covenant" or "adopted son") but still a man among men. This is the content of "sacral" kingship despite the long development and great changes which it went through in its course from Saul to Solomon (to mention only the most formative period for this portion of the religion of Israel). Yes, Yahweh malak: He reigns; He is King, not the man whom He has placed over His people.

References and Notes

Chapter I

- 1 A. R. Johnson, "Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship: Divine Kingship and the Old Testament," ET LXII, 2 (1950-1951), 36.
 - 2 Johnson, "Living Issues," ET LXII, 2, 37.
 - 3 See the discussion in A. R. Johnson, "The Psalms," The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 181ff.
 - 4 S. H. Hooke, The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual (London, 1938), 57.
 - 5 A. R. Johnson, "Hebrew Conceptions of Kingship," Myth, Ritual and Kingship, ed. S. H. Hooke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958), 226.
 - 6 Johnson, "Hebrew Conceptions," 231.
 - 7 See Johnson, "Hebrew Conceptions," and H. Frankfort, The Problem of Similarity in Ancient Near Eastern Religions (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951) for some of the points of view (in English).
 - 8 A. Alt, "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina," Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, II (München: C. H. Bech'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), 1-65. (Due to the difficulty in language, this writer was not able to take full advantage of this work, but it and those stemming from it proved to be extremely helpful.)
- M. Noth, "Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament," Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957), 188-229.

- 9 The term sacral will be used consistently instead of divine when referring to the king in this paper because it has a more neutral meaning and will have less tendency to prejudice our discussion.

Chapter II

- 1 For a discussion of the source theory and those sections of the Pentateuch assigned to each source, see any standard introduction to the literature of the Old Testament. For references, see the bibliography, appended to this paper.
- 2 The so-called Deuteronomic history will be discussed in the next chapter, the one devoted to the Former Prophets.
- 3 It is well known that each of the sources of the Pentateuch contains elements which are much older than the date of the actual writing. While source will usually be used in this paper, the writer does not wish to give the impression that some elements of P, for example, might possibly be older than some elements of J. In any case, the roots of all the sources are old and may be of much help to us.
- 4 This writer is aware that some scholars would continue the J-document down to the empire in the books of the Kings. Since this is difficult to demonstrate and, in the end, immaterial, so far as our investigation is concerned, the practice of not continuing J beyond the Pentateuch will be followed here.
- 5 See especially A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gads, 1959), 5th ed., II, 25ff.
- 6 H. H. Guthrie, Jr., God and History in the Old Testament (Green-

wich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1960), 53.

7 If this last does belong to E. See R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), 175.

8 This has reference only to the Pentateuch, of course; the Deuteronomistic history will be considered as a separate entity in the next chapter.

9 C. R. North, "Pentateuchal Criticism," The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956), 49.

10 See especially G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy," Interpreter's Bible, ed. G. A. Buttrick et al. (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1953), II, 311ff. and G. von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, trans. D. Stalker (Chicago: Henry Regenery Company, 1953).

11 Wright, "Deuteronomy," IB, II, 324 and von Rad, 68.

12 Wright, "Deuteronomy," IB, II, 441.

13 Wright, "Deuteronomy," IB, II, 441.

14 See North, "Pentateuchal Criticism," Pfeiffer or Bentzen, Introduction, II, for bibliography as well as other standard introductions mentioned in the bibliography appended to this paper.

15 Guthrie, 95ff.

16 B. W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), 391.

17 See, for example, Bentzen, Introduction, II, 59f.

18 Unpublished lecture notes of F. M. Cross, Jr., O. T. 102 (Harvard Divinity School, fall 1961), 7 December 1961.

- 19 K.-H. Bernhardt, Das Problem der altorientalischen Königsideologie im Alten Testament (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961), 94, 95.

Chapter III

- 1 G. W. Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1959), 76.
- 2 Since he would be the heir (see v. 6), he would seem to be the one to inherit the throne of David, but at this point in Israel's history such is evidently not the case. We see this in the fact that David can appoint his successor, v. 20.
- 3 As we shall see later, the anointing has importance as a religious rite, probably indicative of the choice of Yahweh, at least in some sense.
- 4 M. Noth, The History of Israel, trans. S. Godman (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), 197ff., and J. Bright, A History of Israel (London: SCM Press, 1960), 181ff.
- 5 See, for example, R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), 342ff.
- 6 Though I must admit to a dislike of saying that one source is absolutely older than another.
- 7 G. W. Anderson, 75, 76.
- 8 In the sources we have, Saul is called a leader or prince (na-ghidh) always except in II Samuel 5:2 when he is called a king (the significance of which I am not sure, though if Dr. Cross is correct, this is saying that David is the military leader here, not Saul). This title is often used of David, especially in this source (I Samu-

el 25:30; II Samuel 5:2, 6:21, 7:8 and parallels in the books of the Chronicles). Dr. Cross of Harvard has said (recorded in his unpublished lecture notes 7 December 1961) that this term refers to a military figure; this at least accords with the early usage and at least some of the later usage (cf. Isaiah 55:4). There is some change, however, with the title being used of priests in other of the later writings (cf. Jeremiah 20:1 and Nehemiah 11:11).

9 One must admit that some of the reason for this might be the plain political fact that there would have been a fight which David might have lost. On the other hand, this writer sees no real reason to doubt the tradition that David did respect the fact that Saul had been the anointed of Yahweh. After all, he named two of his sons born at Hebron in good Yahwistic fashion, Adonijah and Shephatiah, the name Yahweh being a part of both: Yahweh is Lord and Yahweh is Judge (II Samuel 3:2).

10 S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 240.

11 H. H. Guthrie, Jr., God and History in the Old Testament (Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1960), 41ff.

12 J. Gray, "Canaanite Kingship in Theory and Practice," VT II (1952), 194. See also the reference given there to A. Alt, Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina. This article also refers to those holding the common position, at least with respect to the fact of Jerusalem's having had a king. Let me add to the references given there: M. Noth, "Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament," Gesammelte Studien

zum Alten Testament (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1957), 218; and G. W. Ahlström, "Der Prophet Nathan unter der Tempelbau," VT XI (1961), 117ff.

13 H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, BKAT, XV/2 (Neukirchen Kreis, 1960), 881.

14 M. Noth, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1957), 184.

15 This explanation is given by Dr. Cross in unpublished lecture notes (12 December 1961).

16 There may also be some anti-king bias in the figure of Samuel and the importance he is given, but much more of this will be seen in the next section of this paper and will be more apparent there.

17 G. W. Anderson, 74, 75.

18 G. W. Anderson, 75.

19 B. W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), 119.

20 G. B. Caird, "Samuel," IB II (New York: Abingdon, 1953), 864f.

21 Noth, History, 222; Caird, 865; Cross, notes, 12 December 1961.

22 Bentzen, Introduction, I, 161; Caird, 865.

23 Caird, 1085.

24 Cross, notes, 12 December 1961.

25 Caird, 1167.

26 Cross, notes, 12 December 1961.

27 Driver, 361.

28 G. von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, trans. D. Stalker (Chicago: Henry Regenery Company, 1953), 74.

29 C. R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History (London:

The Epworth Press, 1953), 87.

30 The term Deuteronomist will be used for convenience; it is recognized that there were probably many Deuteronomistic editors, but they all exhibit the same point of view and will be considered collectively.

31 G. W. Anderson, 96.

32 Of course, we see that the sons of Samuel were judges after their father in the anti-monarchical source of Samuel (cf. I Samuel 8:1). Whatever the accuracy of that statement, it does not affect the fact that, so far as we can see in the history given us in the book of Judges, the early judges of Israel did not establish any dynasty. The charisma died with them and Yahweh raised up a new man when it was necessary.

33 On the other hand, there is the possibility that the situation was not precisely as pictured in the portion of Judges since there has been a selection of materials used. In general, though, one has the feeling that there is basic dependability here.

34 G. W. Anderson, 74.

35 G. W. Anderson (74) places it in the 10th century B. C. and Pfeiffer, while calling it a part of the early source, also places it early, 342ff.

36 J. Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture, A. I. Fausböll (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), III-IV, 43.

37 J. Pedersen, III-IV, 46.

38 Of course, one reason that the Deuteronomist cites these sources so often may well be that they are available in written, official

form. For the earlier history, he may have to be satisfied with what he can find and use it with a minimum of reworking and editing.

39 G. W. Ahlström, "Der Prophet Nathan und der Tempelbau," VT XI (1961), 121f.

40 Compare, for example, the famous, for Anglicans, case of the marriage which Henry VII contracted for his son Arthur with Catherine of Aragon.

41 See Noth, History, 209ff., and Bright, 199ff.

42 Bright, 201.

43 Bright, 200, and references cited in note 86.

44 Noth, History, 211, and the references cited in note 1.

45 See especially G. E. Wright, Biblical Archaeology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957), 120ff. (chapter VIII).

46 Wright, Archaeology, 136ff.

47 W. F. Albright, "The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization," The Bible and the Ancient Near East (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1961), 328-362; see especially 347ff.

48 J. Morgenstern, "The King-God among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes," VT X (1960), 138-197.

49 Morgenstern, 140.

50 Wright, Archaeology, 136, 137.

51 "Ugaritic Myths, Epics, and Legends," trans. H. L. Ginsberg, Ancient Near Eastern Texts, ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1955), 129ff.

52 The importance which this came to have for Israel can be seen by

the comment that when the ark was placed in the debhîr, the "glory of Yahweh filled the house of Yahweh" (I Kings 8:11).

53 Morgenstern, 177.

54 For a brief description of the "schools," see A. R. Johnson, "The Psalms," The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956), 181ff., with the relevant bibliographical citations. For the most complete bibliography (although with gaps) and a survey, especially in the psalms, see the work of K.-H. Bernhardt, and the bibliography, 307-324.

55 Morgenstern, 185.

56 Morgenstern, 195.

57 This is not to say that the institution of kingship did not have anything to do with the religion (on this, see below), but that there was nothing comparable in the north to the overtones contained in the phrase, the "house of David" for Judah.

58 For the situation in both Israel and Judah, see Noth, History, 224ff.

Chapter IV

1 H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, BKAT XV/1 (Neukirchener Verlag, 1959), 540; see also A. Weiser, Die Psalmen II, ATD 15 (4th rev. ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955), 366f., who argues for a pre-exilic date.

2 G. von Rad, Genesis, trans. J. H. Marks (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1961), 13ff.

3 Kraus, 615f., and Weiser, 402ff.

- 4 All verse-numbering in the psalms, unless otherwise noted, is the numbering as found in the MT.
- 5 G. Ahlström, Psalm 89: Eine Liturgie aus dem Ritual des Leiden Königs, trans. H.-K. Hacker and R. Zeitler (C. W. K. Gleerups, 1959), 59ff. See also the references given there.
- 6 Ahlström, Psalm 89, 183.
- 7 Dr. F. M. Cross, Jr., unpublished lecture notes from O. T. 102 (Harvard Divinity School, fall 1961), 14 December 1961; and Kraus, 616. On the other hand, see Ahlström, Psalm 89, and A. R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955), 22ff.
- 8 Ahlström, Psalm 89, 182.
- 9 Johnson, Sacral Kingship, 23. One may also note the use of 'Elyon in v. 28, which, with its possible connection with Jerusalem (see, e. g., Genesis 14), might add credence to this view.
- 10 H. Gunkel and J. Begrich, Einleitung in die Psalmen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933), 140.
- 11 Kraus, 12ff.; Weiser, 74; Johnson, Sacral Kingship, 120ff.
- 12 A. R. Johnson, "The Psalms," The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956), 190.
- 13 S. H. Hooke, "Myth and Ritual: Past and Present," Myth, Ritual, and Kingship (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958), 12ff.
- 14 H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Myths, Epics, and Legends," Ancient Near Eastern Texts, ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1955), 142, col. 2, ff. This provides a convenient

source for a translation of the text. Some references are KRT A:

(i) l. 41, (ii) l. 77.

15 J. Gray, The Legacy of Canaan (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), 153.

16 J. Pedersen, Israel (London: Oxford University Press, 1959),
trans. A. Møller, I-II, 46ff.

17 Kraus, 752ff.

18 Kraus, 752; Weiser, 475; Johnson, Sacral Kingship, 121, 122;
E. A. Leslie, Psalms (New York: Abingdon Press, 1949), 101; A. Bentzen, King and Messiah (London: Lutterworth, 1955), 87 n.6 (giving both his and G. Widengren's translation).

19 Kraus, 759.

20 Johnson, Sacral Kingship, 121.

21 See Kraus, 752 and 760f., for bibliography and discussion.

22 Gunkel, 140.

23 Kraus, 330; see also, Weiser, 243.

24 Kraus, 331 and 334, 335.

25 C. R. North, "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship," ZAW
IX (1932), 27ff.

26 Kraus, 335.

27 North, 29.

28 See the excellent brief discussion in Kraus, 879ff. (Exkurs 6)
and the literature cited on p. 876.

29 The one point on which this writer would really raise a question concerning the discussion of Kraus (and Rost) is the connection with II Samuel 7. While one might grant that this psalm could find some

root in II Samuel 7, the covenant as such is not there mentioned and this leaves us with the necessity for still another source. This source could be found in "David's Last Words" (II Samuel 23) and traditions following from it.

30 From the view we have had of Solomon, one might expect his cult to have changed the least of almost all (except those under expressly foreign domination; e. g., Manasseh); even here, though, this writer would postulate some concession to the Yahwism of the people; e. g., the thought presented earlier about one interpretation of "adoptive sonship."

31 A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gøtzsche, 1959), II, 213.

32 Bentzen, Introduction, II, 215.

33 Bentzen, Introduction, II, 215.

Chapter V

1 We saw that the covenant had probably begun in the north at Shechem; so it is not surprising that Israel (the northern tribes) would have the covenantal idea ingrained in them, unlike Judah.

2 W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. J. A. Baker (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1961), I, 124f.

3 See, for example, the discussions of Egypt and Mesopotamia in H. Frankfort et al., Before Philosophy (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959).

Bibliography

- G. W. Ahlström, "Der Prophet Nathan und der Tempelbau," VT XI (1961).
- _____, Psalm 89: Eine Liturgie aus dem Ritual des leidenden Königs, trans. by H.-K. Hacker and R. Zeitler. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups, 1959.
- W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity (2nd edition with a new introduction). Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1957.
- _____, "The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization," The Bible and the Ancient Near East, edited by G. E. Wright. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961.
- A. Alt, "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina," Kleine Schriften II (2nd revised edition). München: C. H. Bech'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959.
- _____, "Das Königtum in den Reichen Israel und Juda," Kleine Schriften II (2nd revised edition). München: C. H. Bech'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959.
- B. W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- G. W. Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd, 1959.
- A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, I, 5th edition. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1959.

- _____, Introduction to the Old Testament, II, 5th edition. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1959.
- _____, King and Messiah. London: Lutterworth, 1955.
- _____, "The Cultic Use of the Ark in Samuel," JBL 67 (1948).
- K.-H. Bernhardt, Das Problem der altorientalischen Königsideologie im Alten Testament. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- J. Bright, A History of Israel. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- G. B. Caird, Introduction and Exegesis of Samuel, IB II, edited by G. A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.
- K. R. Grim, The Royal Psalms. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1962.
- F. M. Cross, Jr., Unpublished Lecture Notes, Old Testament 102. Harvard Divinity School, fall 1961.
- R. deVaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, trans. by J. McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.
- G. R. Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956.
- S. R. Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy, ICC, 3rd edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1960.
- _____, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. New York: Meridian Books, 1960.
- _____, Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, 2nd revised edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913.
- W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. by J. A. Baker. London: SCM Press, 1961.

- H. Frankfort et al., Before Philosophy. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959.
- _____, The Problem of Similarity in Ancient Near Eastern Religions. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- C. Gadd, Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East. London: British Academy, 1948.
- N. K. Gottwald, A Light to the Nations. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.
- J. Gray, "Canaanite Kingship in Theory and Practice," VT 2 (1952).
- _____, "Cultic Affinities between Israel and Ras Shamra," ZAW 62 (1950).
- _____, "The Hebrew Conception of the Kingship of God," VT 6 (1956).
- _____, The Legacy of Canaan. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957.
- H. Gunkel and J. Begrich, Einleitung in die Psalmen, HKAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933.
- H. H. Guthrie, Jr., God and History in the Old Testament. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1960.
- E. R. Hardy, Jr., "The Date of Psalm 110," JBL LXIV (1945).
- A. M. Honeyman, "The Evidence for Regnal Names among the Hebrews," JBL 67 (1948).
- S. H. Hooke, ed., Myth, Ritual, and Kingship. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- _____, The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual. London: Milford, 1938.
- E. O. James, The Ancient Gods. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1960.
- H. G. Jefferson, "Is Psalm 110 Canaanite?" JBL LXXIII (1954).
- A. R. Johnson, "Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship: Divine Kingship

- and the Old Testament," VT LXII, 2 (1950-51).
- _____, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955.
- _____, "The Psalms," The Old Testament and Modern Study (Ed. H. H. Rowley). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen. BKAT XV/1-2. Neukirchener Verlag, 1960.
- E. A. Leslie, The Psalms. New York: Abingdon Press, 1949.
- J. A. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings, ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1960.
- G. F. Moore, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.
- J. Morgenstern, "The King-God among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes," VT X (1960).
- S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. by G. W. Anderson. New York: Abingdon Press, n. d.
- C. R. North, "Pentateuchal Criticism," The Old Testament and Modern Study (Ed. H. H. Rowley). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- _____, The Old Testament Interpretation of History. London: The Epworth Press, 1953.
- _____, "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship," ZAW 50 (1932).
- M. Noth, Exodus, trans J. S. Bowsen. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- _____, "Gott, König, Volk ~~im~~ Alten Testament," Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1957.

_____, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1957.

_____, The History of Israel, trans. S. Godman. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1960.

J. H. Patton, Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1944.

J. Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture, I-II, trans. A. Möller. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

_____, Israel: Its Life and Culture, III-IV, trans. A. I. Fansböll. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948.

J. B. Pritchard, ed., Ancient Near Eastern Texts, 2nd ed. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1955.

W. Rudolf, Chronikbücher, HAT 21. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955.

J. C. Rylaarsdam, Introduction and Exegesis of Exodus, IB I, ed. G. A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952.

C. A. Simpson, Introduction and Exegesis of Genesis, IB I, ed. G. A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952.

J. Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, ICC, 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956.

H. P. Smith, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel,

ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

E. Voegelin, Order and History, Vol. I: Israel and Revelation. Louisiana State University Press, 1956.

G. von Rad, Genesis, trans. J. Marks. London: SCM Press, 1961.

_____, Studies in Deuteronomy, trans. D. Stalker. Chicago: Henry Regenery Company, 1953.

A. Weiser, Die Psalmen, I, ATD 14, 4th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.

_____, Die Psalmen, II, ATD 15, 4th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.

G. E. Wright, Biblical Archaeology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.

_____, Introduction and Exegesis of Deuteronomy, IB II, ed. G. A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.

_____, The Faith of Israel, IB I, ed. G. A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952.